

Public Document Pack



**North East
Derbyshire**
District Council

Contact: Asher Bond
Tel: 01246 217375
Email: asher.bond@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk
Date: Thursday, 16 September 2021

To: **All Members of the Clay Cross Town Board**

You are invited to attend the next meeting of the Clay Cross Town Board to be held on **Friday, 24 September 2021 at 9.00 am by Zoom Meeting Platform**. Access credentials to the meeting will be sent to you separately.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sarah Skuberg". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Joint Head of Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer

A G E N D A

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Declarations of Interest

Members are requested to declare the existence and nature of any disclosable pecuniary interests and/or other interests, not already on their register of interests, in any item on the agenda and withdraw from the meeting at the appropriate time.

3 Minutes of Last Meeting (Pages 3 - 5)

To approve as a correct record and the Chair to sign the Minutes of the Clay Cross Town Board held on 18 June 2021.

4 Board Replacement (Pages 6 - 7)

5 Terms of Reference Update (Pages 8 - 10)

6 Key Issues and Risks (Pages 11 - 14)

7 Scoping Documents (Pages 15 - 82)

Appendix To Follow

- 8 **Any Other Business**
9 **Date of Next Meeting**
10 **Exclusion of Public**

The Chair to move:-

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the following items of business to avoid the disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3, Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

- 11 **3D Modelling** (Pages 83 - 87)
12 **Business Case Assurance** (Pages 88 - 122)
13 **Early Release Funding** (Pages 123 - 128)
14 **Land Assembly** (Pages 129 - 132)

We speak your language

Polish

Mówimy Twoim językiem

Romanian

Vorbim limba dumneavoastră

Urdu

ہم آپ کی زبان بولتے ہیں

Chinese

我们会说你的语言



North East
Derbyshire
District Council



If you require this agenda in **large print** or another format
please call us on **01246 217753** Text No: **07800 00 24 25**



If you require an adjustment to enable you to participate in or access the meeting please contact the Governance Team at least 72 hours before the meeting starts.

CLAY CROSS TOWN BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY, 18 JUNE 2021

Present:

Gary Golden (Chair) (in the Chair)
Councillor Carolyn Renwick (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Nigel Barker
Councillor Alex Dale
Janine Foxhall
Andrew King
David Malone
Lee Rowley
Nick Holland

Gill Callingham
Peter Dewhurst
Tom Goshawk
Tony King
Councillor Gerry Morley
Marie Cooper

Also Present:

| | |
|------------|--|
| L Hickin | Joint Director of Corporate Resources and Head of Paid Service |
| K Apps | Head of Economic Growth, Regeneration & Housing Delivery |
| B Harrison | Senior Regeneration Officer and Urban Designer |
| D Stanton | Governance Officer |
| J Bradley | Executive Assistant |

CXT Apologies for Absence

B/11/

21- Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Kenyon (NEDDC), Alison
22 Westray-Chapman (Interim Head of Economic Development DCC) and Melanie
Phythian (Department Business, Energy and Industry Strategy).

CXT Declarations of Interest

B/12/

21- There were no interests declared at this meeting.

22

CXT Minutes of Last Meeting

B/13/

21- RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the last meeting of the Clay Cross Town Board
22 held on 30 April 2021 be approved as a correct record.

CXT Terms of Reference - Working Groups

B/14/

21- The Clay Cross Town Board received a report which updated Board Members on
22 the establishment of a number of working groups and sought approval for their
associated terms of reference.

Board Members heard that following the appointment of consultants Amion to prepare detailed business cases for the ten projects identified by the Clay Cross Town Board, the Board requested that working groups were established to oversee the projects.

It was proposed that a total of five new working groups were established to join the two already in place. The five additional working groups proposed were:

- Clay Cross Creative
- Clay Cross Rail Station Feasibility
- Communications and Community
- Low Carbon
- Town Centre Regeneration

The Head of Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Delivery confirmed that the Board remained in control of the process, and that the working groups would not make decisions. Board Members noted that a scoping document would be an early task for the established groups, and that Board Members could act as sponsors and feedback the work of the groups to the Clay Cross Town Board meetings.

The Board requested a community engagement report which would help supplement the existing Youth Board so that all groups in the community could be included.

Board Members agreed to accept the terms of reference as outlined in the report, but that an amended terms of reference would be brought back to the Board at the September meeting. A formal scoping document which clearly outlined the remit of the working groups would be determined when the working groups commenced in July, with those documents being circulated to Board Members at the end of that month.

RESOLVED – That the working groups and their respective Terms of Reference are approved.

CXT **Amion - Business Case Development Consultants**

**B/15/
21-
22**

The Clay Cross Town Board received a presentation from Peter Alford (Amion – Business Case Development Consultants).

The presentation outlined a number of themes including an introduction to Amion and the team; the Towns Fund – Process; Business Cases; Purpose and Key Requirements; Projects – Overview and Status; and next steps.

The Board was reminded that there were ten projects planned at a total of £74.15 million which included low carbon housing, a creative hub, rail station feasibility, and a Sharley Park Community Hub. It was stated that a social value element would form an integral part of the case' strategic element.

The Board discussed the housing allocation being reduced from £1.5 million to £0.6 million. This was agreed with the Chair and Vice Chair.

The Clay Cross Town Board requested that a Gantt chart be produced and provided to the working groups for each business case. Board Members would also receive a copy of the presentation after the meeting.

RESOLVED – That the update be noted.

CXT **Update on Submission**

B/16/

21-

22

The Head of Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Delivery informed the Board that following the Business Case Assurance going out to tender, discussions had taken place with Chesterfield Borough Council and Broxtowe Borough Council about a partnership to procure a framework. It was stated that this would reduce the overall cost as opposed to procuring the service on our own. The Board agreed to proceed with the proposed partnership.

RESOLVED – That the update be noted.

CXT **Any Other Business**

B/17/

21-

22

The Clay Cross Town Board heard that there was the potential for the Board to bid into additional funding from the Cultural Development Fund, where the Towns Deal Fund for creative space could be used as match. The bid was for between £2 million to £5 million for capital works around cultural space.

The Head of Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Delivery advised that he would produce a briefing paper on the funding and circulate to Board Members via email requesting approval to express an interest.

CXT **Date of Next Meeting**

B/18/

21-

22

The date of next meeting was scheduled to take place on 17 September 2021.

North East Derbyshire

Clay Cross Town Deal Board (CCTDB)

24 September 2021

Replace Cllr Alex Dale with Cllr Charlotte Cupit

Report of the Head of Service Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Growth

Classification: This report is public

Report By: Karl Apps

Contact Officer: Karl Apps

PURPOSE / SUMMARY

It is proposed that Cllr Alex Dale the Leader of North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC) and Cabinet member at Derbyshire County Council (DCC) is replaced on the CCTDB by Cllr Charlotte Cupit. The rationale for the change in membership is that Cllr Dale through his existing commitments is not able to attend the Clay Cross Town Deal board meetings. Cllr Cupit is the Deputy Leader at NEDDC, represents Shirland as a District Councillor and Clay Cross North as County Councillor.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That CCTDB notes the contents of this report
2. That the CCTDB endorses Cllr Cupit replacing Cllr Dale on the Board.

REPORT DETAILS

1 Background (reasons for bringing the report)

- 1.1 As part of central government funding requirements there needs to be representation on the CCTDB from all tiers of local Government. The expectation is the board is a public/private partnership to help deliver the Clay Cross Town Deal.
- 1.2 The Leader of NEDDC needs to be represented on the CCTDB but is not able to attend the board meetings due to existing external commitments.

1.3 In these circumstances it is usual for the Deputy Leader to attend meetings representing the Political Leadership of NEDDC in their place

2. Details of Proposal or Information

2.1 To ensure the Leader is represented at the board meetings it is proposed that Cllr Cupit attends the meetings in Cllr Dales place.

2.2 Cllr Cupit is a District Councillor representing Shirland a settlement near Clay Cross and is also the Deputy Leader for NEDDC.

2.3 Cllr Cupit is also a County Councillor representing Clay Cross North and therefore has a keen interest in ensuring that the Clay Cross Town Deal reflects the needs and requirements of the residents/businesses and other stakeholders of Clay Cross.

3 Reasons for Recommendation

3.1 The Leader of NEDDC is not able to attend the board meetings due to existing commitments. This would mean that the Deputy Leader attends in the Leaders absence.

3.2 Cllr Cupit as Deputy Leader is very familiar with Clay Cross and represents a local settlement at a District Council level. Cllr Cupit also represents Clay Cross North at a County Council level so is the natural choice to sit on the CCTDB.

4 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

4.1 To not replace Cllr Dale has been discounted as the prospectus expects all levels of Local Government to be represented. It is therefore vital that the Leader of NEDDC or their designated representative sits on the board

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

| Appendix No | Title |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| Background | |
| Previous board reports | |

North East Derbyshire District Council

Clay Cross Town Deal Board (CCTDB)

24 September 2021

Terms of reference update

Report of the Head of Service Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Growth

Classification: This report is public

Report By: Karl Apps

Contact Officer: Karl Apps

PURPOSE / SUMMARY

To present the updated terms of reference (ToR) as agreed with the working groups associated with the business cases. The working groups have agreed to the ToR with the only change being the frequency of meetings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the CCTDB notes the contents of the report

2. That the CCTDB agrees to the updated ToR for the working groups associated with the business cases. The only change being the frequency of the meeting from monthly to bi-monthly.

IMPLICATIONS

Finance and Risk: Yes No

Details:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Legal (including Data Protection):

Yes

No

Details:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

On Behalf of the Solicitor to NEDDC

REPORT DETAILS

1 **Background** *(reasons for bringing the report)*

- 1.1 As part of the business case development a number of working groups have been created to support the business case development.
- 1.2 These groups represent technical experts and relevant stakeholders for the various thematic areas.
- 1.3 The CCTDB approved the ToR for the working groups but asked that they were reviewed by the working groups and changes reported back to be approved.

2. **Details of Proposal or Information**

- 2.1 The various working groups have met and started the work to develop the business cases.
- 2.2 The first point of order for the working groups was to review and agree the ToR developed by the CCTDB.
- 2.3 The working groups accepted the ToR but suggested that the frequency of the meetings was moved from monthly to bi-monthly. This gives Amion et al time to progress the business cases. There may be occasions where meetings may need to take place more frequently than bi-monthly if work needs to be progressed.

3 **Reasons for Recommendation**

- 3.1 The working groups were happy to accept the ToR as suggested by the CCTDB.
- 3.2 The only suggestion was to change the frequency from monthly to bi-monthly to give the consultants more time and to ensure an efficient use of the working groups' time.

4 **Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection**

- 4.1 There are no alternative options considered.

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

| Appendix No | Title |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| Background Papers | |
| Click here to enter text. | |

North East Derbyshire District Council

Clay Cross Town Deal Board (CCTDB)

24th September 2021

Key Risks and Issues

Report of the Director for Growth

Classification: This report is public

Report By: Maria Curran, Interim Project Manager

Contact Officer: Maria Curran

PURPOSE / SUMMARY

To draw the Board's attention to several key risks and issues emerging during the business case preparation phase in order to provide an indication of the current position and prospects of finalising the Business Case Summary for submission to MHCLG by March 2022.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the CCTDB notes the contents of the report.
2. That the Board endorses the measures for minimising programme delays and completing the required business cases for the projects identified in the Clay Cross Town Investment Plan.

REPORT DETAILS

- 1 **Background** (*reasons for bringing the report*)
 - 1.1 As part of the route to securing funding, project development and business case completion and assurance at the local level, must be successfully concluded within 12 months of the Heads of Terms agreement. Accordingly finalising business cases for Clay Cross projects was envisaged to progress at pace and be concluded by the end of this calendar year. This would enable local assurance to be completed and the submission of the Summary Document to be submitted to MHCLG by March 2022.

- 1.2 As part of the system to monitor and manage risk, several issues and risks have emerged that have the potential to detrimentally impact this timescale. These are being raised with CCTDB as part of its risk oversight function.

2. Details of Proposal or Information

- 2.1 Work continues across all projects but the team is having to spend significantly more time on several key tasks, such as updating and finalising Scoping Plans, undertaking baseline surveys and engaging with partners and stakeholders to inform business cases. This helps improve the robustness of approach but is beginning to impact on progress – the status of an increasing number of tasks is moving to amber. Consequently concluding some of the business cases may extend into early 2022.
- 2.2 The completion of business cases was intended to be marginally phased but reprofiling/ re-prioritising the completions timeline will need to be considered. This would benefit the assurance process in that it too would be appropriately staggered thereby minimising pressure at the back end of the programme and ensuring completion ahead of the March 2022 deadline. Progress against the attached Summary Programme (Appendix 1) will continue to be monitored, and the risk of any other significant delays reported to future Board meetings.
- 2.3 Discussions within the Creative Hub Working Group have highlighted uncertainty around future management arrangements for Hub - the creative stakeholders on the Working Group are not currently interested in assuming management responsibility for the building. Potential options such as another organisation or NEDDC operating the facility will need to be explored but it is vital that implementation arrangements are evidenced as part of the 'management case' section of the Business Case.
- 2.4 As part of the work evidencing market demand for leisure uses on the Bridge Street site, discussions with potential operators have identified a lack of investment interest primarily because of the proximity of Clay Cross to Chesterfield. Although there could be interest in 'pop up' leisure activities and experiences in the town, the Town Centre Regeneration Working Group considers these would be better suited to the new Square and associated with a new market offer. Consequently the Working Group will contemplate appropriate development options and/or phases for the Bridge Street site.
- 2.5 Additionally in the Town Centre, the availability of the updated transport model is delayed, meaning that baseline evidence demonstrating the need for a clear set of connectivity/ movement interventions is not available. While the team will continue to work closely with DCC to identify alternative sources of evidence, this position risks undermining the credibility of the business case for Clay Cross Connections projects.

- 2.6 Consequently 'Connections' may need to progress as a programme business case (with NEDDC as the accountable body) and include appropriate arrangements for the defrayal of funding as proposals are worked up for individual projects.
- 2.7 MHCLG revised guidance signals that Town Deal Funding Agreements will be issued on a 'year-on-year' basis and not for the length of a project. This creates a risk for projects delivered over different/ multiple years, raising the potential for future years' funding gaps as well as the probable need to underwrite financial liability when entering into construction contracts.

3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 Several risks and issues have been identified that could impact on the successful conclusion of the required business case preparation and assurance work and these are being raised to ensure the proposed approaches to managing these are acceptable to the CCTDB as part of its risk oversight function.

4 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

- 4.1 There is no other option.

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

| Appendix No | Title |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Appendix 1 | Summary Programme Gantt Chart |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| WORKPLAN: | Clay Cross Towns Fund Business Cases |
| WORKSHEET | Summary Workplan |
| VERSION: | 2.1 |
| DATE: | 14/09/2021 |

| | | Sept | | | | Oct | | | | Nov | | | | Dec | | | | Jan | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|-----|---|----|----|-----|---|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|---|
| Stage | | 6 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 25 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 22 | 29 | 6 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 3 | 10 | 17 | 24 | |
| Market Street/Bridge Street | Strategic case | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Economic case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | |
| | Commercial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Financial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Management case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Final business case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ |
| Clay Cross Connections | Strategic case | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Economic case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | |
| | Commercial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Financial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| | Management case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| | Final business case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ |
| Clay Cross Creative | Strategic case | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Economic case | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Commercial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Financial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Management case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Final business case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| Clay Cross Skills Hub | Strategic case | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Economic case | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Commercial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Financial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | |
| | Management case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| | Final business case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| Clay Cross Low Carbon Homes | Strategic case | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Economic case | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Commercial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Financial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| | Management case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| | Final business case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| Low Carbon Workspace | Strategic case | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Economic case | | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Commercial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Financial case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Management case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Final business case | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ◆ |
| Clay Cross Energy Network Strategy | Strategy brief and procurement pack | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Strategic Assessment document | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clay Cross Rail Feasibility Study | SOBC brief and procurement pack | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Strategic Assessment document | | | | | | | | | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

North East Derbyshire District Council

Clay Cross Town Deal Board (CCTDB)

24th September 2021

Scoping Reports

Report of the Director for Growth

Classification: This report is open

Report By: Bryan Harrison

Contact Officer: Bryan Harrison

PURPOSE / SUMMARY

1. To present a range of project scoping reports.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the board approve the scoping reports as presented

IMPLICATIONS

Finance and Risk: Yes No

Details:

There are no financial implications

[Click here to enter text.](#)

On Behalf of the Section 151 Officer for NEDDC

Legal (including Data Protection): Yes No

Details:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

On Behalf of the Solicitor to NEDDC

REPORT DETAILS

1 **Background** *(reasons for bringing the report)*

1.1 To provide board members with a range of scoping reports for the projects identified in the Clay Cross Town Investment Plan (TIP).

2. **Details of Proposal or Information**

2.1 Consultants Amion are in the process of preparing business cases for the ten projects identified in the Clay Cross TIP

2.2 To support and guide this process, working groups have been assembled composed of key stakeholders.

2.3 Following discussions at these working groups it has been agreed that to provide clarity on what each project will (and will not) be responsible for delivering a scoping report is produced for nine of the ten projects in the TIP. Sharley Park Leisure Centre is not included as this is now moving into delivery phase.

2.4 The scoping reports have been shared with members of the working groups and are attached as Appendix 1.

Recommendation

3.1 To approve the attached scoping reports

4 **Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection**

4.1 The scoping reports are required to provide clarity and certainty of project scope to support the completion of the business cases, so no other option is appropriate.

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

| Appendix No | Title |
|--|-----------------|
| Appendix 1 | Scoping Reports |
| Background Papers | |
| Previous board reports. Clay Cross Town Investment Plan. | |

CLAY CROSS CONNECTIONS: COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Town Centre Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses / working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed business case by Q4 2021.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Baseline evidence:** due to delays to the completion of transport modelling for Clay Cross, there is a need to explore alternative sources of evidence. This work is ongoing in discussion with DCC. This may impact on the ability of the business case to define a specific pipeline of proposed interventions and outputs. As a working assumption, it is envisaged that the business case will outline an indicative package of measures in accordance with the investment objectives, with proposals worked up for specific interventions prior to any draw down of funding.
- **Key working assumptions:** no decisions have yet been taken but the chosen focus of the Working Group will be based on the above changes to scope unless the Town Board directs otherwise.

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- **notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;**
- **notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;**
- **acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;**
- **endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.**

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal board (date to be confirmed), which will primarily focus on providing more detail around: (i) the baseline work underway (ii) the potential scope of interventions identified as part of an indicative works package and (iii) arrangements for a consultation event to scope key issues / challenges with community representatives. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Gill Callingham, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Maria Curran, PMO
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by Karl Apps, Head of Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Delivery, NEDDC who, based on this early stage of the proposal development, deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN | |
|--|---|
| 1. Project Name | Clay Cross Connections |
| 2. Project Aim | <p>Summary aim of the overall project: To promote a package of measures that enhance connections within the town, reduce congestion, reduce the impact of traffic on pedestrians and promote more sustainable and active travel options.</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: To develop Green Book compliant Business Case for a package or programme of works for submission to the Clay Cross Town Board.</p> |
| 3. Project Description/ initial considerations | <p>A programme of works centred on High Street, Market Street and Eyre Street to reduce the adverse impacts of traffic on the quality of the street environment; to overcome barriers to movement and improve linkages to and across the town centre; and the improvement and urban greening of key pedestrian and cycle links to local destinations, particularly the new Town Square, the Esplanade to Tesco and pleasant connections between Sharley and Kenning Parks.</p> <p>Initial considerations relating to a proposed package of connectivity enhancement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severance created by A61 which is a busy regional/sub-regional route, the default diversion for the parallel M1, high HGV use. The A61 is on the western fringe of the town centre. • There is a mix of regeneration and transport strategies developed over the last 10-15 years in place from various regional sources (East Midlands, Derbyshire, NEDDC). Continued engagement with partners is needed to ensure alignment with strategic objectives and interventions proposed through the Local Transport Plan. • From a sustainability perspective, there is a focus on improved air quality through congestion relief and low emission vehicles. Regard will need to be given to the impact of UKG policy measures aimed at promoting this agenda. • There is a significant level of parking available in the town centre (including NEDDC managed parking). The coordination of parking provision across the town is limited and in a number of instances they contribute poorly to the quality of the environment within the town centre. <p>To address a shortfall in the evidence base, DCC is progressing survey and modelling work to inform the scoping and prioritisation of potential interventions. It is noted that this was scheduled to be available in September but DCC is now advising that this will be delayed by months and may not be available for the business case stage.</p> |
| 4. Definitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Clay Cross”: for the purpose of this document, Clay Cross is defined as the area defined through the Town Deal. • Connections: a package of interventions that enhance connectivity through improvements to established or proposed infrastructure. The interventions will reduce congestion, improve the coherence of the network and enhance the quality of the environment for pedestrians. |
| 5. TIP Stage Assumptions | <p>A preliminary scoping exercise was undertaken by Ramboll (as part of the TIP team) to inform the budget cost allocation for an initial package of targeted improvement works as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A61 improvements – construction estimate of £200k-£800k • South East Arc Road/Cycle Route - £150k • East West Route Improvement - £150k |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing traffic flow in the town centre - £250k <p>The budget allocation also included provision for a wider programme of works to improve access to the town centre from outlying zones, having regard to the wider programme objectives for the Town Investment Plan.</p> <p>The TIP recorded the following assumptions on this initiative when submitted to CLG:</p> <p><i>“Works on High Street, Market Street and Eyre Street to reduce the adverse impacts of traffic on the quality of the street environment the improvement of key pedestrian and cycle links to local destinations and assets” pg.6 & 12</i></p> <p><i>Theme – “Improving connectivity – enhancing connections within the town, establishing the centre as a hub with high quality, sustainable linkages to neighbourhoods, workplaces and open spaces. Measures to improve connectivity will promote more sustainable and active travel options for residents and businesses, while mitigating the negative impacts of strategic highway infrastructure on residents of the town” pg. 35</i></p> <p><i>“A package of interventions aimed at improving traffic management and the public realm and promoting active transport options within Clay Cross” pg.45</i></p> <p><i>Timescales – planning and delivery over the period to Q3 2025</i></p> <p>Regard should also be had to the TIP2 document (submitted to CLG) which sets out further detail in respect of the aims and assumptions at the point at which the Town Investment Plan was prepared.</p> |
| 6. Scope of Works | <p>Scope of the overall project: interventions focusing upon (i) improving connectivity through addressing severance (ii) reducing traffic congestion within the town centre, focusing particularly upon the A61 High Steet corridor and Market Street (iii) improving walking and cycling routes to and within the town centre. It is envisaged that the project will comprise a package of investments that will address existing connectivity issues and contribute to mitigating the impact of other TIP projects. The package of interventions identified may be subject to review over the full delivery period in response to updated evidence, project specific and wider strategic drivers.</p> <p>Scope of the current stage: to deliver a HM Treasury Green Book compliant business case (using the template attached in Section 16) by Q1 2022. The business case will be prepared based on an agreed package of interventions which will be scoped based on strategic objectives and informed by the best available evidence at the point at which the business case is completed. Due to gaps in the available evidence base due to the absence of up-to-date survey data and modelling, the package of interventions will be determined through engagement with transport officers and targeted survey work (to be scoped in discussion with DCC). It is envisaged that the package of measures will be refined post funding approval based on the availability of baseline data and a coherent transport plan. Consideration will be given to business case requirements for establishing a funding programme to support phased investment in targeted measures.</p> <p>The business case will be based on available project information developed to concept design stage and informed by supporting investigations. This is equivalent to the Outline Business Case stage as set out within HMT guidance.</p> |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| | Section | Description | Evidence/source |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Strategic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change • Risks and dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Baseline transport survey data • Consultation with key stakeholders • Risk register |
| | Economic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping • Economic benefit assessment • Economic costs • Value for money • Sensitivity analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping and appraisal framework • Cost Benefit Analysis technical note |
| | Financial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project costs • Funding and revenue • Affordability analysis • Financial risks and implications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project cost plan • Match-funding commitments |
| | Commercial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status and approvals • Procurement strategy • Commercial delivery plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project delivery plan |
| | Management case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project governance • Assurance and compliance • Programme management • Risk management • Stakeholder engagement • Monitoring and evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project organogram • Subsidy control – legal opinion • Programme/Gantt Chart • Risk register • Communications plan • Monitoring and evaluation plan |
| | Other supporting material | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project designs - concept • Site investigation report (desktop) • Letters of support |
| | <p>Subject to approval, it is envisaged that NEDDC will programme implementation taking account of the delivery of other Town Centre projects and securing co-funding, and progress procurement of delivery partner(s). It will use Towns Fund investment for the delivery of proposed schemes.</p> | | |
| 7. Working Assumptions / Hypotheses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location: the TIP identifies a focus for investment around “High Street, Market Street and Eyre Street to reduce the adverse impacts of traffic on the quality of the street environment”. These will remain a strategic focus, but no locations have been formally determined at this stage. In the absence of a comprehensive evidence base, it is envisaged that the identification of locations will be based on available data relating to target points and qualitative information provided by experienced Transport Officers. • Intervention type: the TIP references the importance of reinforcing the role of the town centre as a hub, enhancing connectivity, improving the environment for pedestrians and enhancing sustainable linkages. A wide range of potential interventions will remain in scope. It is envisaged that consideration of options will take place at an intervention level to ensure value for money is optimised. | | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs and funding: it is assumed that the cost of “on-site” infrastructure works associated with other towns fund projects will not draw upon funding for the Connections project. This funding could be considered to mitigate “off-site” infrastructure costs where appropriate. • Delivery mechanisms: no mechanism has yet been agreed for the delivery of interventions funded through the programme. The arrangements will be considered further as the pipeline of potential interventions is developed. • Monitoring and evaluation: as an exemplar initiative, resource should be made available for effective monitoring, evaluation and the dissemination of best practice. | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|----------|--|-----|
| 8. Dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence base: More detailed baseline work is being progressed in respect of access, transport and parking at a Clay Cross level including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Updating the DCC transport model ○ Footfall data and mapping using the Hook database (NEDDC, Aug 21) ○ Parking surveys – requirements being established (Sept 21) <u>It is noted that the timescales for the DCC transport model have been delayed and that this may not be available to inform the business case preparation. Alternative sources of evidence will be identified in discussion with DCC but this may need to be reflected in the scope of the business case.</u> • Other TF projects: there will be significant co-dependencies with other projects advanced under the TIP, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Town Centre Regeneration:</i> it is envisaged that there will be significant co-dependencies with this scheme, relating to demand development associated with new facilities, events and activities on site, impact on the bus station and potential redevelopment of car parks. ○ <i>Public Transport:</i> Increases to bus journey times and the risk of detrimental impact on bus patronage (and in turn on congestion and air quality) and the cost of operating local bus routes. ○ <i>Railway Feasibility Study:</i> Multi-modal connectivity between possible station locations and the town centre (in principle rather than design detail) ○ <i>Skills & Enterprise Hub:</i> The anticipated number of new learners assisted means a wider geographic focus than simply Clay Cross which makes consideration of how people access the Hub a significant inter-dependency. • Key Partners: willingness to engage by key stakeholders; aligning with the wider transport plan for Clay Cross, North East and Derbyshire as a whole • Consultation: The need for and approach to wider community engagement will be informed by the Communications & Community Working Group and could modify the workplan. • Match-funding: The Town Investment Plan identified a provisional allocation of £1m of co-funding. | | | | |
| 9. Outputs | <p>The indicative outputs and outcomes identified within the TIP are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="459 1868 1469 1966"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="459 1868 1286 1912">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="1286 1868 1469 1912">Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="459 1912 1286 1966">New or upgraded cycle or walking paths</td> <td data-bbox="1286 1912 1469 1966">5km</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Indicator | Quantity | New or upgraded cycle or walking paths | 5km |
| Indicator | Quantity | | | | |
| New or upgraded cycle or walking paths | 5km | | | | |
| Version_1.0 | PMO | | | | |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 | | | | |

| | |
|--|------|
| Wider cycling infrastructure such as cycle parking | 5km |
| Remediation/Delivery of quality residential or commercial space in key locations | 8 ha |
| Delivery of new public spaces | 2 ha |
| Outcomes | |
| Enhanced vehicle flow | TBC |
| Improved perceptions of the place | TBC |
| Number of residents using active mode to access town centre on a regular basis | TBC |

The scope of the town centre regeneration project and deliverable outputs will be subject to further appraisal and it is envisaged that the outputs identified in the table above will be subject to variation.

However, following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the 'in principle' funding award, MHGLG now requires the following mandatory outputs to be collected/ reported annually:

- Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)
- Co-funding committed (private and public)
Target of £1m
- Co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public)
- Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation
- Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects
- Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects
- Total length of pedestrian paths improved
Target of 5km
- Upgraded cycling routes
Target of 5km

These will form an integral part of the final outputs, the remainder of which will be scoped based on an indicative schedule of proposed projects under the preferred option, pending detailed design development.

Potential outcomes will be scoped and estimated to inform the cost benefit analysis as part of a Green Book compliant option appraisal. Projections will be identified within a benefit realisation plan and aligned with the monitoring and evaluation plan prepared in respect of the proposed option.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| 10. Costs and funding | Costs and funding: | | | | | | |
| | (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total |
| | Towns Fund | | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 3.0 |
| | Match/co-funding | | | | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case stage costs: at this stage it is not anticipated that further drawdown of funding will be required to fund the preparation of the business case document. However, there is a need for greater clarity around the evidence base. Survey and modelling work progressed by DCC has been delayed and will not be available to inform the business case development. On this basis, there may be a need to carry out targeted survey work to inform the development of a project pipeline. The business case team will work with DCC to scope this baseline and report back to the Board. • Cost profile: the allocation of funding at the TIP stage was based on professional judgements based on a package of potential interventions. • Match funding: allowance has been made for match/co-funding as part of the overall package of works. This could include public sector co-funding or developer contributions to mitigate the impact of future development proposals. Potential opportunities for co-funding will be discussed with Derbyshire County Council (Highways Authority) and D2N2 as part of the option development work. |
|--|--|


| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 11. Team Roles | Business case team: | | |
| | Partner | Lead | Role |
| | AMION: | Pete Alford | Coordinate business case and manage the project team |
| | NEDDC: | Karl Apps | Oversight of additional research commissions where needed to inform the business case (transport surveys) |
| | Buttress: | Martin Kirkpatrick | Masterplan – option development |
| | Edge: | Geoff Tinsley | Cost assessment Public realm design |
| | Ramboll: | Ed Kerr | Strategic advice in relation to infrastructure and transport |
| | Nexus: | Pete Tooher | Planning strategy Partner engagement / coordination |
| | Wider project team: | | |
| | Partner | Lead | Role |
| NEDDC Economic Development | Gill Callingham / Karl Apps | Team coordination Support land assembly strategy Commission additional research needed to inform the business case Working Group and wider stakeholder engagement | |
| | Maria Curran | PMO Urban regeneration & supporting WG | |
| NEDDC Planning | Adrian Kirkham Graeme Cooper Helen Fairfax | Guide planning strategy for scheme Wider planning framework for Clay Cross town centre | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| | DCC Highways and transport | Chris Hegarty / Jim Seymour Dean Jones | Highway and transport survey data Bus Station relocation Active travel data for Clay Cross Guide project scoping | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|------|------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------|--|--------------|--------|---|---|------------|---|---------------------|------------|---|----------------------|--------|--|-------------------------------------|--------|--|--|--------|---|------------------------------------|--------|---|---------------------|--------------|---|--|-----------------|--|---------------------|--------|---|-------------------------|--------|---|----------------|-----|---|
| 12. Workplan | <p>Outputs and Timeline:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Task</th> <th>Date</th> <th>Lead/role/responsibilities</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baseline report (desk-top)</td> <td>Sept – Dec 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of highway model for Clay Cross - DCC Review of existing baseline data including transport survey data – Ramboll Review of wider funding opportunities – Ramboll/DCC </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Scoping further transport / travel survey</td> <td>Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping further survey data needed to inform the assessment - Ramboll Commission further transport survey work required – NEDDC/DCC Engagement with Transport officers at DCC Progress parking survey - DCC </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consultation</td> <td>Oct 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community workshop to focus on key access priorities / issues </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Option scoping and agreement of intervention objectives</td> <td>Oct-Nov 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present a schedule of objectives aligned to baseline review/wider masterplanning for strategic interventions – NEDDC/ AMION Long-list Option workshop with Working Group </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Option shortlisting</td> <td>Nov-Dec 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare prioritisation framework and alongside concept plans preparation, identify shortlist of options – AMION / Ramboll </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Draft Strategic Case</td> <td>Nov 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft section circulated for comment – AMION </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Updated concept plans and cost plan</td> <td>Nov 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept plans – Buttress/Edge High level schedule of costs - Edge </td> </tr> <tr> <td>WG consideration of options and preferred option</td> <td>Nov 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC/AMION/ Buttress </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Board Approval of preferred option</td> <td>Dec 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Draft Economic Case</td> <td>Nov – Dec 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost benefit analysis – AMION/Ramboll Drafting - AMION </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Draft Business Case including WG Check & Challenge</td> <td>Dec 21 - Jan 22</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial case – AMION/NEDDC Financial case – AMION Management case – AMION/NEDDC </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final Business Case</td> <td>Jan 22</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Business Case Assurance</td> <td>Jan 22</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Board Approval</td> <td>TBC</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | Task | Date | Lead/role/responsibilities | Baseline report (desk-top) | Sept – Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of highway model for Clay Cross - DCC Review of existing baseline data including transport survey data – Ramboll Review of wider funding opportunities – Ramboll/DCC | Scoping further transport / travel survey | Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping further survey data needed to inform the assessment - Ramboll Commission further transport survey work required – NEDDC/DCC Engagement with Transport officers at DCC Progress parking survey - DCC | Consultation | Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community workshop to focus on key access priorities / issues | Option scoping and agreement of intervention objectives | Oct-Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present a schedule of objectives aligned to baseline review/wider masterplanning for strategic interventions – NEDDC/ AMION Long-list Option workshop with Working Group | Option shortlisting | Nov-Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare prioritisation framework and alongside concept plans preparation, identify shortlist of options – AMION / Ramboll | Draft Strategic Case | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft section circulated for comment – AMION | Updated concept plans and cost plan | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept plans – Buttress/Edge High level schedule of costs - Edge | WG consideration of options and preferred option | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC/AMION/ Buttress | Board Approval of preferred option | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC | Draft Economic Case | Nov – Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost benefit analysis – AMION/Ramboll Drafting - AMION | Draft Business Case including WG Check & Challenge | Dec 21 - Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial case – AMION/NEDDC Financial case – AMION Management case – AMION/NEDDC | Final Business Case | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION | Business Case Assurance | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC | Board Approval | TBC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |
| Task | Date | Lead/role/responsibilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline report (desk-top) | Sept – Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of highway model for Clay Cross - DCC Review of existing baseline data including transport survey data – Ramboll Review of wider funding opportunities – Ramboll/DCC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scoping further transport / travel survey | Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping further survey data needed to inform the assessment - Ramboll Commission further transport survey work required – NEDDC/DCC Engagement with Transport officers at DCC Progress parking survey - DCC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consultation | Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community workshop to focus on key access priorities / issues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Option scoping and agreement of intervention objectives | Oct-Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present a schedule of objectives aligned to baseline review/wider masterplanning for strategic interventions – NEDDC/ AMION Long-list Option workshop with Working Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Option shortlisting | Nov-Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare prioritisation framework and alongside concept plans preparation, identify shortlist of options – AMION / Ramboll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft Strategic Case | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft section circulated for comment – AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Updated concept plans and cost plan | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept plans – Buttress/Edge High level schedule of costs - Edge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WG consideration of options and preferred option | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC/AMION/ Buttress | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Board Approval of preferred option | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft Economic Case | Nov – Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost benefit analysis – AMION/Ramboll Drafting - AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft Business Case including WG Check & Challenge | Dec 21 - Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial case – AMION/NEDDC Financial case – AMION Management case – AMION/NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Final Business Case | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business Case Assurance | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Board Approval | TBC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---------------|
| | The identified workplan and milestones will be subject to determining the need for further survey work to establish need / demand and clear case for change. | | | | |
| 13. Risk | A detailed Risk Register will be prepared and regularly reviewed with WG. Current key high-level risks: | | | | |
| | Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status |
| | Business risk | Failure to define clear objectives for the project aligned to the Town Investment Plan and wider investment package | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure SMART objectives established and linked to core aims and benefits realisation plan Ensure that objectives inform the scoping and appraisal of options | Open |
| | Evidence base | The risk that there is inadequate evidence to support the identification and prioritisation of measures aimed at enhancing connectivity, addressing congestion and enhancing the quality of the pedestrian environment | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with DCC and other partners to develop a robust evidence base Identify targeted studies that could be progresses to address gaps in available evidence Promote the development of a programme level business case to secure an allocation for draw down over the longer term | Open |
| | Highways | Risk that the impact on highways and transport infrastructure is unacceptable or incapable of appropriate mitigation. | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing baseline information to confirm assessment of need Instruct further transport survey work to better inform the baseline and likely cost of options. Establish highways technical Task & Finish Group and clearly defined Terms of Reference as a priority. Engage with DCC and other stakeholders in the scoping and design stage High-level transport/ junction modelling of short-listed options to better understand impact | Open |
| | Financial | Risk that level of TF allocation insufficient to achieve objectives | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure clear objectives to inform scoping of options Align with wider investment projects | Open |
| Risk that match-funding is not | | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for match funding to be scoped at | Open | |
| Version_1.0 | | | PMO | | |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | | | 17/09/21 | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------|---|------|
| | | available at the level identified within the Town Investment Plan | | an early stage in the option appraisal process | |
| | Programme | Risk that delays to the project result in unforeseen consequences across other elements of the scheme | Medium /High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project scoping and design development overseen by Town Centre Working Group to ensure alignment with wider regen proposals | Open |
| 14. Comms / consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication assumption: A clear plan for communications will be critical for this project given sensitivities around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The limited evidence base currently available to inform the scoping of interventions; community feedback in consultation undertaken to date identifying town centre connectivity as a strategic priority; The potential for changes in the scope of proposals in response to the wider programme of investment. <p>The approach to communications will need to be clear from the outset and should ensure that the risk of misalignment of expectations within the community is minimised.</p> Consultation assumption: a two stage community consultation process was undertaken to inform the development of the TIP. The Working Group has highlighted the importance of sustaining community consultation. Reflecting the points outlined above and in the absence of a robust evidence base, the focus of community consultation at this stage should be around validating qualitative assessments of key issues/challenges, strategic objectives and intervention scope. An interactive community workshop event with residents and businesses could offer an appropriate approach. | | | | |
| 15. Assumed Business As Usual Status (BAU) | The BAU case assumes that in the absence of a package of works that investment in connectivity will be progressed on a piecemeal basis in response to specific development initiatives or under strategic transport plan initiatives. Under this scenario, it is not envisaged that issues identified at the TIP stage (relating to severance, congestion and poor quality environment) will be satisfactorily addressed at a town centre level. | | | | |
| 16. Business Case stage deliverable |  <p>Clay Cross Business Case Template.docx</p> | | | | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross F: Connections to/across the Town Centre | 17/09/21 |

CLAY CROSS CREATIVE: COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Clay Cross Creative Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal Board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses/working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed business case to MHCLG by March 2022.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Reprofiling of costs:** the original Town Investment Plan envisaged the spend of match funding in FY 2021 / 2022. This spend will now take place in the next financial year 2022/2023 given the time it will take to agree, procure and mobilise this project.
 2. **Outputs:** at this stage the high-level objectives outlined for the project remain the same, however further work will be undertaken to verify/confirm that the scale of the proposed outputs (in particular the number of jobs created) and outcomes (visitors to events; enterprises and start-ups supported) are realistic and it is likely that the Working Group may propose alternatives in the future.
 3. **Creative Hub Tenants:** while First Arts have confirmed that they are interested in the project, they cannot commit to becoming a tenant in the building at this stage, until further consultation work has been carried out, and there is greater certainty regarding what the proposed hub will offer.
- **Key working assumptions:** no decisions have yet been taken but the chosen focus of the Working Group will inevitably mean that some outputs become more likely than others. The current focus remains on the delivering the key objectives described in the TIP through the refurbishment of the three buildings, also outlined in the plan:
 - Old Constabulary
 - DACES Storage
 - Methodist Church

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;
- notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;
- acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

- **endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.**

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal board on (date to be confirmed), which will primarily focus on providing more detail around (i) the types of creative activities that will be the focus for the hub (ii) the buildings that will be required and (iii) the proposed operating model. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;
- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Cllr Barker, Chair of the Working Group (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document) and Clay Cross Town Deal Board Sponsor
- Martyn Handley, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by Gill Callingham Director of Growth NEDDC, based on this early stage of the proposal development, deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal:

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

| CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN | |
|--|---|
| 1. Project name | Clay Cross Creative Hub |
| 2. Project aim | <p>Summary aim of the overall project: To provide a focal point for creative enterprise; arts and social programmes with a focus on engaging the community, young people, around creative, artisan and social enterprise; and to provide a base for creative stakeholders.</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: To build a business case based on existing green book requirements which can be submitted to MHCLG for the release of up to £0.85m of funding provisionally allocated to this initiative.</p> |
| 3. Project description/ initial considerations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the location and potential conversion and refurbishment of buildings within the town centre to create artist and creative workspace, including spaces for meetings, offices, a gallery, box park/artisan worksheds and gardens. • The project will provide a focal point and base for the creative sectors, and promote a range of community activities within the facility and across the wider town. • The project was included within the Town Investment Plan following engagement with prospective delivery partners, highlighting the opportunity to develop the creative sector aligned to wider proposals for the town centre. The market analysis highlighted a lack of comparable facilities within the locality. |
| 4. Definitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Clay Cross”: for the purpose of this document, Clay Cross is defined as the area defined through the Town Deal. • Workspace: this could include co-working/shared space; office; maker space; workshop facilities • Creative Hubs: vary by size, structure, operation but can include collectives, co-operatives, maker labs, incubators, and can be static, mobile or online. |
| 5. TIP Stage Assumptions (LP) | <p>The TIP recorded the following assumptions on this initiative when submitted to MHCLG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Clay Cross Creative - conversion and refurbishment of buildings on Market Street to create artist and creative workspace, including spaces for meetings, offices, a gallery, box park/artisan worksheds and gardens;” (p. 6) • “Description: Creative sector led community asset, repurposing historic buildings to create a focal point for enterprise, performance and activity within the town centre” (p. 45) • “Project sites: Clay Cross Creative” (p.46) • “Rationale: * Improvement of a key heritage building to strengthen the Conservation Area, currently at risk * Provide new, diversified job opportunities * Assist in rejuvenating the Town Centre * Addresses the lack of cultural and entertainment assets and key services in Clay Cross * Potential to build on the activity of First Arts and others to foster a creative makers’ initiative” (p.53) • “Outputs: * Refurbished workspace floorspace * New businesses and jobs * Increased visitors to the town centre * New arts, cultural & creative events” (p.53) • “Outcomes / indicators: * Improve perceptions and profile of the area * Increase number of visitors” (p.53) • “Delivery programme: Business case development: Q1 – Q2 2021, Planning: Q3 2021, Procurement: Q4 2021, Delivery and fit-out: Q1 – Q3 2022” (p.66) |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Outputs: * Commercial floorspace: 1,200 sq m, * Industrial floorspace: 1,200 sq m” (p.67) • “Construction phase outputs: Person years employment: 12, Gross value added: £0.4m, Apprenticeships supported: 1” (p.67) • “Operational phase: Gross employment: 34 FTE, Gross value added: £1.9m” (p.67) • “Fiscal impact: Business rates: £29,000/pa” (p.67) | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|--|---|
| 6. Scope of Delivery | <p>The Town Investment Plan was based on initial proposals and included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purchase and refurbishment of the former constabulary building (DCC); Methodist church and storage space at Derbyshire Adult Education Centre (DACE); • Provision of a base for creative stakeholders (First Arts/Junction Arts) and delivery of an events programme and activities • Creation of workspace for artists and creative enterprises – scale/type to be confirmed through consultation with both residents and potential freelancers/artists (maker spaces; desks; office) • Delivery of shared facilities for creative & community use – e.g. gallery; garden; pop-up retail; events space; equipment <p>An indicative budget allocation made allowance for capital works associated with a basic refurbishment of premises. No detailed arrangements were made in relation to the operation of the facility, other than funding being conditional upon the preparation of a business plan demonstrating the ongoing financial sustainability of the scheme.</p> <p>Key issues for consideration in developing the business case include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location – consideration is being given to three potential sites for the Creative Hub based on a review of assets. • Ownership – parts of the proposed site lie outside of the ownership of the public sector. Significant acquisition costs could impact on the deliverability of the facility. • Financial sustainability – it is critical that the facility is financially and operationally sustainable. This should be informed by robust market testing and a credible delivery model, set out within a business plan prepared in partnership with key project partners. <p>The business case will be prepared based on available project designs and supporting information developed to RIBA Stage 2, alongside a business plan for the operation of the facility. This is equivalent to the Outline Business Case stage as set out within HMT guidance.¹</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="472 1688 1489 1912"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="472 1688 662 1727">Section</th> <th data-bbox="662 1688 1123 1727">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1123 1688 1489 1727">Evidence/source</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="472 1727 662 1912">Strategic case</td> <td data-bbox="662 1727 1123 1912"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change </td> <td data-bbox="1123 1727 1489 1912"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Market Demand Assessment • Risk register </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Section | Description | Evidence/source | Strategic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Market Demand Assessment • Risk register |
| Section | Description | Evidence/source | | | | | |
| Strategic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Market Demand Assessment • Risk register | | | | | |

¹ [Guide to developing the Project Business Case \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk/guidance/developing-a-project-business-case)

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks and dependencies | |
| | Economic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping • Economic benefit assessment • Economic costs • Value for money • Sensitivity analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping and appraisal framework • Cost Benefit Analysis technical note (AMION) |
| | Financial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project costs • Funding and revenue • Affordability analysis • Financial risks and implications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project cost plan • Business plan (including financial appraisals) • Match-funding commitments |
| | Commercial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status and approvals • Procurement strategy • Commercial delivery plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project delivery plan • Market demand assessment |
| | Management case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project governance • Assurance and compliance • Programme management • Risk management • Stakeholder engagement • Monitoring and evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project organogram • Subsidy control – legal opinion • Programme/Gantt Chart • Risk register • Communications plan • Monitoring and evaluation plan |
| | Other supporting material | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business plan (Junction Arts / First Arts) • Project designs (RIBA2) • Site investigation report (desktop) • Building surveys • Planning statement and evidence of pre-app • Events/Activity plan • Letters of support |

7. Working assumptions/hypotheses

- **Potential Sites** – no decisions have been made but the TIP hypotheses suggested three potential buildings for the hub, and this remains the working assumption at this stage – the former constabulary building (DCC), Methodist church and storage space at Derbyshire Adult Education Centre (DACE). It should be noted however that the Methodist Church is currently in private ownership, and there was an assumption that a leasehold agreement would be negotiated with the owner;
- **Delivery mechanism** – it is assumed that North East Derbyshire Council will oversee the phased programme of refurbishment works, following contractor procurement. However, this is conditional on confirmation of the governance structure, preparation of a business plan, and confirmation of the relocation of the countryside service.
- **Potential Delivery partners** – the TIP assumed that the hub would provide a base for First Arts/Junction Arts to deliver their events programme and activities in the area; and creative space for artists and the community. While First Arts is still interested in assisting with the development of the hub, they are not currently in a position to commit to becoming a tenant, until further work is done to shape what the space might look like. Junction Arts have recently relocated to West Studios in Chesterfield. The Procurement of an operator/partners for the Hub are outside the scope of the project.
- **Deliverables** – the purchase and refurbishment of the former constabulary building (DCC); Methodist church and storage space at Derbyshire Adult Education Centre (DACE) are the key deliverables. A high level business

Version_1.0

PMO

Clay Cross C: Creative Hub

17/09/21

| | <p>plan/operational framework will also be developed for the hub (proportional to the business case requirements).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs – the overall financial contribution of the Clay Cross Town Deal to this project is assumed to be £0.85m (as outlined in the TIP). Match funding of £0.15m is to be expected to be provided, potentially by Arts Council England, although at this stage the provider has not been determined. This funding is to cover the acquisition and refurbishment costs. No operational costs have been included in the TIP. • Overall viability – the viability of the Creative Hub will depend on securing a lead partner to champion the project and the development of a high-level business plan which outlines the financial sustainability of the hub. | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|----------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--------------|----|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 8. Key Dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a project champion – to lead on the development of the scheme and assist in the preparation of a business plan. • Scoping market demand from potential freelancers and artists; and understanding the scale of community use – which will impact on the size of the space required. • Acquiring and refurbishing the requisite buildings (depending on amount of space required) within the financial envelope provided. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Outputs | <p>The following outputs are identified within the Town Investment Plan.</p> <p>Outputs</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Upgraded community facilities</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reuse of historical building</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jobs created</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Creation of shared workspace</td> <td>1,200 m²</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the ‘in principle’ funding award, MHGLG now requires the following mandatory outputs to be collected/ reported annually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners) • Co-funding (£) committed (private and public) • Co-funding (£) spent on project delivery (private and public) • Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects <i>Target 34no. FTE jobs</i> • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects • Number of improved community/sports centres <i>Target 1no.</i> • Number of heritage buildings renovated/restored <i>Target 1no.</i> • Creation of shared workspace <i>Target of 1,200 sqm</i> | Indicator | Quantity | Upgraded community facilities | 1 | Reuse of historical building | 1 | Jobs created | 34 | Creation of shared workspace | 1,200 m ² |
| Indicator | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Upgraded community facilities | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reuse of historical building | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jobs created | 34 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Creation of shared workspace | 1,200 m ² | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of visitors to arts, cultural and heritage events <i>Target of 15,000 visitors</i> • Number of enterprises utilising high quality, affordable and sustainable commercial spaces <i>Target of 20no. enterprises</i> • Number of start-ups and/or scales ups utilising business incubation, acceleration and co-working spaces <i>Target of 10no. start-ups</i> <p>The following proposed outcomes are identified in the Town Investment Plan and projected for the operational stage of the hub project.</p> <p>Outcomes</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="474 645 1487 938"> <thead> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of visitors to arts, cultural and heritage events and venues</td> <td>15,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of enterprises utilising high quality, affordable and sustainable commercial spaces</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of start-ups and/or scale-ups utilising business incubation, acceleration and co-working spaces</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Indicator | Quantity | Number of visitors to arts, cultural and heritage events and venues | 15,000 | Number of enterprises utilising high quality, affordable and sustainable commercial spaces | 20 | Number of start-ups and/or scale-ups utilising business incubation, acceleration and co-working spaces | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------|---|---------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|------|--|--|--|------------------|--|--|------|--|--|--|
| Indicator | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of visitors to arts, cultural and heritage events and venues | 15,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of enterprises utilising high quality, affordable and sustainable commercial spaces | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of start-ups and/or scale-ups utilising business incubation, acceleration and co-working spaces | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Costs | <p>Costs:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="474 1005 1487 1146"> <thead> <tr> <th>(£million)</th> <th>2020/21</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th>2022/23</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Towns Fund</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.85</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Match/co-funding</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.15</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case costs: Early release of some of the Town Deal funding has been approved by MHCLG to help to bring forward projects. The only additional costs that may be necessary for this project relate to detailed business planning if this is deemed necessary for the operation of the Hub. Development of a high level business plan only has been assumed at this stage. • Match costs: the TIP suggested that up to £150,000 match funding may be possible for this project. Following discussions at the Working Group, it was agreed that further exploration of potential funding sources needed to be undertaken. • Town Fund contribution: the financial profile for the project will be kept under review through the building appraisal and development of options. The options and associated outputs and outcomes will be presented to the Working Group as part of its Check & Challenge support. This will also consider affordability (within identified budget thresholds) and expected value for money based on the expected economic benefits. | (£million) | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Towns Fund | | | 0.85 | | | | Match/co-funding | | | 0.15 | | | |
| (£million) | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Towns Fund | | | 0.85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Match/co-funding | | | 0.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Team Roles | <p>The business case team will primarily comprise the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="474 1812 1487 1937"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Lead</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AMION:</td> <td>Maria Salcedo/Pete Alford</td> <td>Coordinate business case and support business planning</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Partner | Lead | Role | AMION: | Maria Salcedo/Pete Alford | Coordinate business case and support business planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Partner | Lead | Role | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMION: | Maria Salcedo/Pete Alford | Coordinate business case and support business planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------|--|
| | NEDDC: | Martyn Handley | Coordinate NEDDC inputs and lead engagement with delivery partners |
| | | Maria Curran | PMO |
| | Buttress | Martin Kirkpatrick | Design |
| | Thomas Lister: | Rachel Lister | Property Advice |
| | Edge: | Geoff Tinsley | Cost assessment |
| | Nexus: | Pete Tooher | Planning/ Stakeholder engagement |

The wider working group who will steer the project between reports to the Town Board comprise the following:

| Partner | Lead | Role |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| NEDDC: | Martyn Handley | Coordinate NEDDC inputs and lead engagement with delivery partners |
| | Maria Curran | PMO |
| | Cllr Barker | Chair of the Working Group |
| | Cllr Powell | |
| | Cllr Cupit | |
| | Cllr Renwick | |
| | Cllr Dale | |
| DCC | Alison Foote | Concept development with partners |
| Clay Cross Parish Council | Cllr Jones | |
| First Arts | Karl Greenwood | As above; Creative stakeholder & potential tenant |
| Junction Arts | Paul Steele | As above; Creative stakeholder & potential tenant |
| | Jane Wells | |
| University of Derby | Dr Peter Dewhurst | |
| Chesterfield College | Mik Godley | |
| Clay Cross Town Deal Board | Gary Golden | |

The overall owner of this project, from a Working Group perspective, is Cllr Barker (as Chair of the Working Group) and Martyn Handley as the appointed officer to lead. Both are ultimately responsible for the output and practical achievability of the proposal.

12. Work Plan

The current working assumptions around the timeline for the business case are as follows:

| Task | Date | Lead/Role/Responsibility |
|------|------|--------------------------|
|------|------|--------------------------|

Version_1.0

PMO


Clay Cross C: Creative Hub

17/09/21

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|---------------|
| | Desk based SWOT review of Creative Hub and Skills Hub to evaluate opportunities for co-location | July 2021 | AMION/TL (complete) | | |
| | Building Survey – review of existing information and visual inspection | August 2021 | NEDDC/DCC/Buttress Buttress to commission measured survey if needed | | |
| | Desk based Heritage Assessment | Oct 2021 | Buttress | | |
| | Partner engagement and consultation (Key stakeholders) | Sept -Oct 2021 | AMION/NEDDC/Nexus | | |
| | Land assembly and decant strategy | Sept - Nov 2021 | Nexus/TL/AMION | | |
| | Creative Enterprise Space – demand analysis | Sept - Nov 2021 | Nexus/TL/First Arts | | |
| | Design brief and options scoping | Oct 2021 | AMION/NEDDC | | |
| | Secure approval of design brief objectives | WG Nov 2021 | AMION/NEDDC | | |
| | Project plans - RIBA 2 including option short-listing | Nov 2021 | Buttress | | |
| | Draft Strategic Case | Oct- Nov 2021 | AMION/NEDDC | | |
| | Cost plan | Oct - Nov 2021 | Edge | | |
| | Draft Economic Case | Oct - Nov 2021 | AMION | | |
| | Business planning | Oct - Nov 2021 | NEDDC/Stakeholders | | |
| | Outline procurement strategy and delivery plan | Nov 2021 | NEDDC | | |
| | Financial appraisal | Nov 2021 | DCC/NEDDC/Partners | | |
| | Draft Business Case | Nov - Dec 2021 | Commercial Case – AMION/TL Financial – AMION/NEDDC/DCC Management (inc risk register and M&E plan) - AMION/NEDDC | | |
| | Present draft Business Case to WG Check & Challenge | Dec 21 | Present Draft Business Case for agreement | | |
| | Final Business Case | Dec 2021 | AMION/NEDDC | | |
| | Business Case Assurance | Jan 2022 | External Commission/NEDDC | | |
| | Board Approval | TBC | | | |
| | <p>The overall timeline for the project remains , for now, those outlined in the TIP, pending further analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case: Dec 2021 • Procurement: Q1 2022/23 • Procurement of a contractor: Q2-3 022/23 <p>Significant further work is required to validate these dates in the coming phase.</p> | | | | |
| 13. Risk | Key risks: | | | | |
| | Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status |
| Version_1.0 | | PMO | | | |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | | 17/09/21 | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------|---|------|
| | Financial | Operational costs/income fail to achieve projections Revenue funding in the business plan not being identified. NEDDC with a liability if business plan fails Match funding: Unable to obtain the necessary match funding to bring forward project | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement and consultation with end users planned Marketing strategy to be embedded in the business plan Engagement with potential funding bodies and investment partners to develop a positive relationship | Open |
| | Stakeholders | Difficult to identify appropriate delivery partners | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build on initial engagement with potential delivery partner First Arts; Junction Arts to inform option scoping Creative Working Group to engage with relevant partners. | Open |
| | Building & structures | Presence of listed/heritage assets which may be unsuitable for demolition/modification | Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building condition survey and heritage assessment to be carried out prior to options study. | Open |
| | Programme | Market engagement - risk of limited interest from delivery partner/end users | Medium /high | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Art/Junction Arts engaged. Consultations with ACE and other stakeholders to develop the concept. Further consultation /engagement planned with potential artists/users to assess demand. | Open |
| 14. Communication/ consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication assumption: A high-level review has been undertaken of the project and it has been agreed that no immediate communications is necessary beyond the overall work being done by project as a whole. It is expected that detailed communications will be needed prior to the submission of a business case. Further details will be provided at a subsequent iteration of this document. As will be the approach for all projects, there is a clear desire to consistently and regularly communicate the overall situation on the CXTD on a regular basis to residents – and this project will be expected to contribute this where required. | | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation assumption: Consultation with residents is being carried out at the end of September as part of an event being delivered by Junction Arts. Further demand assessment/consultation will be carried out with potential creative hub users at the end of Sept/Early October to identify demand for space/types of space required. Further consultation will be ongoing with creative stakeholders First Arts and Junction Arts; and ACE re concept design. |
| 15. Assumed Business As Usual Status (BAU) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The refurbishment of the buildings will not take place in the absence of the Town Deal Funding. • First Arts/Junction Arts will continue to deliver some community creative activities in the area through their existing contracts. |
| 16. Business Case deliverable |  <p>Clay Cross Business Case Template.docx</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross C: Creative Hub | 17/09/21 |

LOW CARBON ENERGY NETWORK STRATEGY: COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Low Carbon Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses / working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed Strategy by Q3 2022.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Scope and phasing of the proposed strategy:** recognising the importance of ensuring a robust evidence base and clear vision for future interventions, a staged approach is now proposed. The first stage will involve detailed baselining, scoping and engagement to determine the rationale for intervention and clear objectives for future investment. Once approved, a range of potential interventions would be scoped and evaluated to identify a phased programme of investment. The second stage would allocate funding to early stage projects. Under this approach, it is envisaged that the Board would approve both stages, with funding drawdown for the stage two interventions dependent upon the preparation of a compliant business case which would be subject to an appropriate appraisal and approval process.
 2. **Cost:** as a result of the above recommendation, it is likely that the preparation of the first stage strategy will not cost the £1,000,000 allocated from the Town Deal and nor will it need match funding. However, the project wishes to retain the allocated Town Deal funds for now, to invest in measures identified through the strategy as part of the second stage described above.
- **Key working assumptions:** no decisions have yet been taken but the chosen focus of the Working Group will be based on the above changes to scope unless the Town Board directs otherwise.

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- **notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;**
- **notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;**
- **acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;**
- **endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.**

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal board on (date to be confirmed) which will primarily focus on providing more detail around (i) the full scope of the strategy based on the final brief agreed by the Working Group and (ii) details of the process for procuring the strategy and (iii) arrangements for appraising and approving interventions promoted through the strategy. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;
- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Cllr Jeremy Kenyon, Chair of the Working Group (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Karl Apps, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by the following Gill Callingham Director of Growth NEDDC, based on this early stage of the proposal development, deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

| CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN | |
|--|--|
| 1. Project Name | Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy |
| 2. Project Aim | <p>Summary aim of the overall project: To strategically assess the feasibility of developing a low carbon energy network in Clay Cross and identify a phased programme of interventions as part of an action plan; to progress first phase enabling and pilot interventions in support of the strategy.</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: to produce an interim “Strategic Assessment” document which will allow funding to be released for the full Strategic Outline Business Case.</p> |
| 3. Project description / initial considerations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The town and wider area have a long-standing association with energy generation linked to coal mining and the associated development of the rail line. This process of developing and subsequent economic restructuring has resulted in a range of long term social, environmental and economic challenges. One of these challenges is anecdotal reporting of the relatively widespread use of coal as a domestic heat source, alongside issues of fuel poverty. • The legacy of historic mine-workings also present a potential asset and opportunity linked to mine water heating and cooling. Other potential assets and opportunities have been identified, including the presence of key sector businesses (Worcester Bosch) and proposed capital investment linked to private sector led housing development (for example at Egstow Park) and through the Towns Fund. Initial engagement with sector partners has highlighted the importance of considering assets as part of a network led strategy. • There is a strengthening commitment to pursuing a low carbon agenda under the UKG climate change targets. These national targets are reflected in the commitments of partners at the local level (including the declaration of a climate emergency by NEDDC and other project partners). • The project recognises that there is a need for significant further investigation and analysis to provide a robust basis for setting appropriate objectives for the local area, underpinning a programme of targeted intervention. • The project was identified as one that could be potentially advanced on a fast-track basis. The original timescales are not capable of being achieved and there will be a need to agree a revised timeline with CLG. |
| 4. Definitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low carbon: defined as measures that contribute to achieving net reductions in the level of carbon emissions beyond those that would be achieved under existing commitments at the UK and regional levels. • Energy Network: a whole system of energy generation, distribution, storage and utilisation. • Pilot: an intervention that seeks to test or otherwise enable wider investment to be secured through de-risking or demonstrating effectiveness/viability. • “Clay Cross”: for the purpose of this document it is accepted that the area under consideration within the scope of the strategy will reflect the existing infrastructure and opportunity assets that lie outside the area designated under the Town Deal, including former mine workings, which nevertheless have the potential to directly contribute to a strategy for Clay Cross Town. |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <p>5. TIP Stage assumptions</p> | <p>At the point at which the TIP was submitted to CLG the proposals for this project were at a very early stage of concept development. The TIP recorded the following assumptions in relation to this initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Low Carbon Energy Network Pilot – to confirm the feasibility of a low carbon energy network for the town exploring the scope for ground sources heat, hydrogen ready technology and a local heat network” pg. 6 • “Low Carbon Energy Network Pilot – working with Worcester Bosch, Cadent and other partners, a project to confirm the feasibility of a local carbon energy network” pg. 12 • “Development of a detailed strategy and route map to achieve local targets for net zero carbon underpinned by detailed baselining and feasibility” pg. 45 • “Capitalises on opportunity afforded by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ new leisure centre delivery with a significant heat load; ○ the commitment of Worcester Bosch to energy innovation within Clay Cross; ○ the presence of a number of significant industrial uses with high energy load; ○ the presence of significant ground source heat to develop a clean growth energy; ○ strategy for the town, potentially utilising hydrogen as part of the energy mix. <p>Addresses high instances of energy poverty and continued extensive use of coal as a domestic energy source and Attraction of new energy sector businesses and development opportunities” pg. 53</p> • Delivery programme – Commence Q1 2021, complete Q2 2022. Pg. 66 <p>Regard should also be had to the TIP2 document which sets out further detail in respect of the aims and assumptions at the point at which the Town Investment Plan was prepared.</p> |
| <p>6. Scope of Delivery</p> | <p>Scope of overall project: the project has two components:</p> <p>(i) Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy (Stage 1) – to prepare a strategy that establishes a clear vision and evidence based actions for a clean growth strategy for Clay Cross based on enhancements to the local energy network. It is envisaged that the Strategy will be prepared on a staged basis, to include (i) baselining; (ii) scoping; (iii) establishing strategic goals; and (iv) formulating a phased action plan including an initial package of ‘pilot’ interventions (Stage 2). This first stage will be delivered by Q4 2022.</p> <p>(ii) Package of interventions (Stage 2) – an initial package of ‘pilot’ interventions that will seek to test, catalyse or otherwise enable a future of investment in support of the objectives agreed through the strategy.</p> <p>Scope of current stage: to produce a ‘Strategic Assessment’ document which will allow TF funding to be released in advance of procuring the Stage 1 Strategy. This document will cover, at a high-level: (i) the local context, (ii) the study objectives, (iii) the study goals, (iv) the procurement process (v) how to expedite the output (vi) Governance and approval process for initial package of investment.</p> <p>Note: This assumes that the Clay Cross Town Board will approve the full investment (£1 million) in advance of procuring the strategy, which will scope the initial package of works. This is based on the assumption that there will be a</p> |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | requirement for a full business case to be prepared in accordance with UKG guidance in relation to the initial package of capital investments. |
| 7. Working assumptions / Hypotheses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial area – the Strategic and implementation will focus upon achieving strategic objectives in respect of Clay Cross, but will recognise that the town forms part of a network of assets and infrastructure that extends beyond these boundaries. It is assumed that this will fall within the scope of the study and may also be a focus for initial investment where justified by the localised benefits. • Wider energy network context – the Strategy will be developed and implemented within a wider context of energy policy and investment at a range of scales. The scope of the Strategy should adopt a community level focus. It should reflect a comprehensive understanding of this wider context and support a localised strategy that is complementary. Key assumptions relating to strategic drivers and associated sensitivities should be clearly described in the strategy. • Project scope – the TIP makes reference to a range of potential measures as part of a strategy, including ground sources heat (including heat from flooded abandoned coal workings in the locality), hydrogen ready technology and a local heat network (linked to other TF projects). All of the identified options would be in scope and should be evaluated as part of an evidence led approach. • Strategy objectives – no decisions have been made regarding the objectives of the Strategy. It is proposed that objectives will be informed by further detailed baseline work and consultation. It is envisaged that the Strategy will be prepared on a staged basis, with approvals at key gateways to ensure local level ownership of the objectives and ultimate scope of the strategy and action plan. • Project approval – it is assumed that the full TF allocation can be approved through the preparation of a high level ‘Strategic Assessment’ (including allocations for future capital investment under Stage 2) subject to demonstrating appropriate processes for the appraisal and approval of proposed interventions. |
| 8. Key Dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The procurement of a suitable and expert delivery partner for the preparation of the strategy • Confirmation from CLG that infrastructure outside of the defined Town Deal area may form part of the agreed scope for the Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy • Securing ongoing engagement from key stakeholders such as the Coal Authority, Cadent and other energy sector partners • The scope and required funding for the pilot(s) will only become known once the Feasibility Study has been completed. Capital investment opportunities/funding for the pilots will be required from the Council and/or partners/ funders. • Unlocking funding for Stage 2 (package of interventions) will be dependent upon identifying an acceptable approval process, to be agreed with MHCLG and the Town Board; identifying a package that fulfils the identified requirements. |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

| 9. Outputs | <p>Outputs:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="459 237 1433 472"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="467 237 1198 282">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="1206 237 1433 282">Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="467 282 1198 327">Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy</td> <td data-bbox="1206 282 1433 327">1 document</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="467 327 1198 472">A programme of capital works determined through the Strategy development process</td> <td data-bbox="1206 327 1433 472">As determined by the project team and Working Group</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the ‘in principle’ funding award, MHGLG now requires additional mandatory outputs to be collected/ reported annually. These are as follows:</p> <ul data-bbox="459 633 1449 958" style="list-style-type: none"> • Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners) • Co-funding committed (private and public) • Co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public) • Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects | Indicator | Quantity | Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 1 document | A programme of capital works determined through the Strategy development process | As determined by the project team and Working Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|----------|------------------------------------|------------|--|---|-------|------------|------|------|------|--|--|---|------------------|--|--|------|--|--|------|
| Indicator | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 1 document | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A programme of capital works determined through the Strategy development process | As determined by the project team and Working Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Costs | <p>The following high-level assumptions around costs have been made:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="459 1059 1449 1256"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="467 1059 619 1104"> (£million)</th> <th data-bbox="627 1059 754 1104">2021/22</th> <th data-bbox="762 1059 890 1104">2022/23</th> <th data-bbox="898 1059 1026 1104">2023/24</th> <th data-bbox="1034 1059 1161 1104">2024/25</th> <th data-bbox="1169 1059 1297 1104">2025/26</th> <th data-bbox="1305 1059 1449 1104">Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="467 1104 619 1182">Towns Fund</td> <td data-bbox="627 1104 754 1182">0.05</td> <td data-bbox="762 1104 890 1182">0.45</td> <td data-bbox="898 1104 1026 1182">0.50</td> <td data-bbox="1034 1104 1161 1182"></td> <td data-bbox="1169 1104 1297 1182"></td> <td data-bbox="1305 1104 1449 1182">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="467 1182 619 1256">Match/co-funding</td> <td data-bbox="627 1182 754 1256"></td> <td data-bbox="762 1182 890 1256"></td> <td data-bbox="898 1182 1026 1256">0.25</td> <td data-bbox="1034 1182 1161 1256"></td> <td data-bbox="1169 1182 1297 1256"></td> <td data-bbox="1305 1182 1449 1256">0.25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul data-bbox="507 1267 1449 1908" style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Assessment costs: it is not assumed that any physical drawdown of money will be needed to create the Strategic Assessment and, instead, this will be completed out of NEDDC / Town Deal BAU resource. • Strategy costs: the initial stage will involve commissioning the preparation of a Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy to provide a comprehensive analysis of needs, demands and opportunities. The costs of this stage have been indicatively estimated at £100k but will be determined through a procurement exercise. • Capital works costs: the balance of the TF funding will be set aside to support capital works needed to pilot or test key interventions identified within the Strategy. These interventions will be detailed within the Strategy and draw down of funding will be supported by a dedicated business case. • Match costs: the TIP suggested that up to £250k match funding may be possible for this project. An initial review has identified a range of established funding sources. A detailed review of match investment opportunities will be carried out as part of the strategy and it is envisaged that this will inform the proposed programme of pilot works. | (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total | Towns Fund | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.50 | | | 1 | Match/co-funding | | | 0.25 | | | 0.25 |
| (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Towns Fund | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.50 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Match/co-funding | | | 0.25 | | | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

11. Team Roles

The business case team will primarily comprise the following:

| Partner | Lead | Role |
|----------|-------------|--|
| AMION: | Pete Alford | Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements |
| Ramboll: | Ed Kerr | Scoping strategy study brief |
| Nexus: | Pete Tooher | Partner engagement |

The wider Working Group, who still steer the project between reports to the Town Board, comprise the following:

| Partner | Lead | Role |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| NEDDC Economic Development | Karl Apps | Lead NEDDC Team inputs and coordination of wider inputs; Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG |
| | Maria Curran | PMO |
| NEDDC / DCC | Cllr Kenyon, Cllr Dale, Cllr Cupit, Cllr Renwick | Chair; Strategic oversight and link to Town Board |
| NEDDC Leisure | Chris Mills | Linkages with Sharley Park leisure centre |
| NEDDC | Ed Owen | Low Carbon strategy |
| Worcester Bosch | Gary Golden; Bob Murdoch | Town Board Chair, energy sector stakeholder |
| Coal Authority | Charlotte Adams | Energy sector stakeholder |
| Cadent | Sally Brewis; Stuart Easterbrook | Energy sector stakeholder |
| Midlands Energy Hub | Michael Gallagher | Energy sector stakeholder |
| DCC | Denise Ludlum; Karen Lynam; Jane Cressey | |

The overall owner of this project within the Working Group is Cllr Jeremy Kenyon (as Chair of the Working group) and Karl Apps (as the officer appointed to lead). Both are ultimately responsible for the output and practical achievability of the proposal.

Specialist inputs and guidance will be provided by other members of the Low Carbon Working Group as required.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 12. Workplan | Outputs and timeline: | | |
| | Task | Date | Lead/role/responsibilities |
| | Determine funding approval requirements | July 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MHCLG engagement – AMION S151 Officer engagement – NEDDC Agree local assurance requirements – NEDDC |
| | Prepare Tender Brief for Study based on WG agreed objectives. Determine the procurement route | August 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine compliant procurement route - NEDDC Identify potential suppliers – NEDDC/ AMION |
| | Produce a draft Strategic Assessment for review by WG | Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION |
| | Working Group review of draft Strategic Assessment | Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |
| | Board approval of tender action | By email | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |
| | Procure consultancy to undertake the Feasibility Study | Oct-Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |
| | Finalise Strategic Assessment based on tender price | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION |
| | Strategic Assessment appraised by external assurance | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to queries - NEDDC/AMION |
| Board Approval of Strategic Assessment for submission to MHCLG | Nov-Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC | |
| Completion of Feasibility Study | Q3 2022 | [Supplier to be confirmed] | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|--|---------------|
| 13. Risk | Key risks: | | | | |
| | Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status |
| | Business risk | Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study | Medium /high | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish clear objectives for the study through the Working Group that are aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross | Open |
| | Procurement risk | Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study | Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate various procurement frameworks and suppliers Tender via a robust open procurement process | Open |
| Programme risk | Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF | Medium /High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule | Open | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|--|------|
| | Programme risk | Reporting timescales are misaligned with delivery plan for low carbon projects funded through TF | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope the brief to ensure that initial findings inform scoping for low carbon projects Engage with CLG to confirm expected timescales | Open |
| | Funding risk | Risk that match funding cannot be sourced | Medium /High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions) | Open |
| 14. Comms / consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication assumption: Given that the preparation of the strategy will run in parallel with the implementation of other Low Carbon projects, there will be a need to consider alignment and positioning in terms of communications. Consultation assumption: the Working Group is keen to run a high-level initial consultation. This could be carried out in relation to the scoping stage to inform the baseline analysis. In addition, there may be opportunities to promote community engagement through the strategy. | | | | |
| 15. Assumed Business As Usual Status (BAU) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAU status – progress towards a low carbon energy network at the local level is determined by UK level policy and market led intervention under national commitments. Baseline work undertaken as part of the first stage (Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy) will clearly define the business as usual position to ensure clarity around the ‘additionality’ of proposed interventions. | | | | |
| 16. Business Case stage deliverable | <p>In advance of a defined scope of works for any proposed capital commitment, a Strategic Assessment will be prepared. This document will cover, at a high-level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the local context the study objectives the study goals the procurement process and how to expedite the output. <p>It is proposed that the Strategy will set out a package of initial interventions (described in the TIP as ‘pilot’ measures) as a focus for TF investment as the first stage of a phased investment plan. A business case will be prepared as part of the commission to secure the draw down of funds.</p> | | | | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version 1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross I: Low Carbon Energy Network Strategy | 17/09/21 |

MARKET STREET AND BRIDGE STREET (TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION): COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Town Centre Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses / working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed business case by Q4 2021.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Scope and phasing of the proposed project:** proposals for the phased regeneration of Market Street and Bridge Street in the town centre are now being advanced as a single project (they were identified separately within the Town Investment Plan). This approach provides greater flexibility to support prioritisation as part of a coordinated investment plan within the budget parameters established through the TIP. The scope of the TF intervention will be determined by means of an option testing process, based on evaluation against critical success factors (including strategic alignment) prior to a full cost benefit analysis. This project links closely with the Clay Cross Connections project as there are dependencies between the projects. The WG covers both the Town Centre and Clay Cross Connections work.
 2. **Outputs:** based on initial demand and affordability assessments, it is envisaged that the level of outputs delivered through project will be lower than at the TIP stage. Further work is needed to determine achievable outputs within clear budget parameters.
 3. **Baseline evidence:** due to delays to the completion of the DCC transport model, there is a need to scope potential measures to ensure that proposals are appropriately evidence at this stage of design development. In addition, consideration should be given to commissioning early stage demand and feasibility testing in respect of proposals for a market offer in Clay Cross.
- **Key working assumptions:** no decisions have yet been taken but the chosen focus of the Working Group will be based on the above changes to scope unless the Town Board directs otherwise.

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- **notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;**
- **notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;**

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

- **acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;**
- **endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.**

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal board on (date to be confirmed) which will primarily focus on providing more detail around (i) Objectives and associated critical success factors for the project (ii) Option framework for intervention (long list options) (iii) Land assembly strategy (iv) Measures to provide connectivity aligned to Clay Connections work (v) Events and activities scoping plan for Clay Cross specifically the Market Square (vi) Stakeholder and Community engagement proposal. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;
- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Gill Callingham, Chair of the Working Group (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Maria Curran, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by Karl Apps, Head of Economic Development, Regeneration and Housing Delivery, NEDDC based on this early stage of the proposal development, who deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Project name | Market Street and Bridge Street (town centre regeneration) |
| 2. Project aim | <p>Summary aim of overall project: To secure the regeneration of priority zones within Clay Cross town centre, supporting priority themes identified within the Town Investment Plan (TIP) to renew the towns heart and re-establish Clay Cross as a market town.</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: To develop concept proposals for a town centre regeneration scheme that support a Green book compliant business case for submission to the Clay Cross Town Board.</p> |
| 3. Project description/ initial considerations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The town centre extends from Market Street in the south to the relatively modern Tesco development in the north, with the A61 comprising the western boundary. The town centre provides the main focal point for retail and associated uses within the town. Alongside customer service focused activities, workspace primarily comprises light industrial and trade units, with very limited office accommodation. There are a limited number of civic buildings within the town centre, including the Adult Education Centre. The leisure centre, hospital and library lie on the edge of centre. • Working with local communities, the Council has played a central role in promoting town centre regeneration over a number of years. In particular, the GMI led scheme delivered a Tesco superstore alongside small retail units and a health centre. The 2013 Regeneration Framework set out aspirations for the town, building upon an earlier 2006 vision prepared by Clay Cross Neighbourhood Partnership. • Re-establishing Clay Cross as a distinctive market town is a longstanding objective referenced in both the 2006 and 2013 framework. Building on these established frameworks, alongside the Clay Cross Feasibility Study Masterplan, a plan led approach was adopted in relation to the development proposals for the town centre at the TIP stage. A spatial strategy was identified as a framework, within which targeted investments would be advanced over a period of 10 years. This approach is consistent with the earlier regeneration frameworks, though the allocation of funding through TF provides a pathway to the delivery of the initial phases. • It is envisaged that the initial phases will advance mixed-use redevelopment of town centre sites to deliver an updated retail, commercial, leisure and residential offer, including a market square and events space. Proposals were outlined within the TIP in respect of identified zones (termed Market Street and Bridge Street). The scope of the proposals was based on high level visioning, having regard to available desk top information. The scope of the project will be subject to further review and option testing. • Town centre sites are subject to a complex array of freehold and leasehold interests. There are extensive public sector ownerships across the town centre, though in a number of instances these are subject to complex lease arrangements. • There is a need to consider existing infrastructure within the scope of on-site regeneration interventions. Alongside the bus station within the Market Street zone, there are opportunities to establish a more coherent |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| | <p>plan for highway and pedestrian connections across the town centre and wider environs. Proposals should align with a wider infrastructure plan for the town.</p> |
| 4. Definitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Centre: a boundary for the town centre is defined within the emerging Local Plan and Clay Cross Feasibility Study Masterplan Report (2020). Based on a review of existing policy objectives and studies, the Town Investment Plan defined two zones as a focus for targeted planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Market Street zone</i> – extending from a Market Street frontage to the south to Harris Way in the north, with Bridge Street running along the western boundary. As defined in the TIP, this zone comprises a number of land parcels: (i) dated retail/business units to the south with on-site parking, (ii) the Bus Station running east to west in the centre, (iii) a more modern courtyard to the north, with small retail units and a health centre enclosing a council owned car park. ○ <i>Bridge Street zone</i> – located to the west of Bridge Street, bounded by Harris Way to the north and Eldon Street to the south. A modern Aldi has been developed to the east of the site (with direct access to the A61). The zone is mixed and includes a range of manufacturing, residential and retail/trade counter premises, alongside a children’s playcentre. • Regeneration: the comprehensive, plan led redevelopment of identified sites or zones in support of strategic objectives, identifying clear outputs that result in enhanced outcomes for the town as a whole or key identified target groups. |
| 5. TIP Stage Assumptions | <p>The proposals for the regeneration of the town centre were outlined in the TIP in two phases, with Phase 1 focusing on the Market Street zone and Phase 2 focusing on the Bridge Street zone. The assessment of each project was based on high level baseline analysis and scheme appraisal which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market assessment – a high level review of demand for proposed town centre uses based on examination of relevant databases showing the take-up of commercial premises, sales rates and values supplemented by engagement with local agents and potential operators; • Supply analysis – a review of the existing development pipeline within Clay Cross and across a wider catchment; • Land ownership – a high level review of freehold ownerships and occupiers, focused on the assets of NEDDC and partners; • Site visit – review of current conditions including on-site assets, constraints and key issues for consideration; • Transport – an initial review of the existing highway network, public transport provision and car parking based on local observation and background data (including bus route information and data) <p>Based on this information, a spatial strategy was developed for the town centre. Concept development proposals were outlined. Financial projections were outlined based on local market values, adopting standard cost rates. In the absence of detailed baseline data, the initial projections assume base land costs for private sector ownerships and do not make provision for abnormal development costs. The financial appraisal informed a preliminary assessment</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

of the total cost and value, with a provisional funding requirement identified in respect of a viability gap.

The TIP recorded the following assumptions in respect of these initiatives when submitted to CLG:

| Market Street | Bridge Street |
|---|---|
| <p><i>“Mixed-use redevelopment for commercial, retail, leisure and residential purposes including a town square events space” pg.6, 11</i></p> <p><i>“Although previous Regeneration Frameworks for Clay Cross have promoted the regeneration of the heart of the town, a number of key objectives remain to be delivered – including the creation of a central space; improved traffic circulation on Eyre Street and Market Street; and the delivery of an attractive, walkable link between Market Street and the edge of centre retail area centred on Tesco” pg. 18</i></p> <p><i>“Within the town centre the focus will be to enliven Market Street, with the redevelopment of land to the north of Market Street, centred around a new market square and the creation of the Skills and Enterprise Hub and Creative Clay Cross immediately to the south.” pg.42</i></p> <p><i>“Phase 1 of mixed use town centre regeneration delivering homes, commercial premises and a market square within an enhanced environment” pg.45</i></p> <p><i>Rationale – “Creation of a square and event space addresses current lack of public space for events; Revitalisation of the Town Centre; Brings retail into the Town Centre; Re-use of vacant properties; Improved connectivity between Market St and commercial/retail development to the north – promoting linked trips, footfall and expenditure in the Town Centre; Market square to provide a focus for community activity, markets and events, increasing footfall, retention of spend and encouraging development of micro businesses; New housing meets need for lower cost affordable homes within the Town Centre.” Pg. 53</i></p> <p><i>Timescales – procurement Q2 2023; Delivery Q1 2025 pg. 66</i></p> | <p><i>“Redevelopment of land at Bridge Street to create a new mixed-use town centre and residential area, improving linkages between the heart of the town centre and adjacent retail areas” pg.6,11</i></p> <p><i>“Development and access improvements to the north of the town centre around Bridge Street will further strengthen the town centre but importantly create a link between the heart of the town centre and edge of centre development around Tesco” pg.42</i></p> <p><i>“Phase 2 of town centre regeneration, relocating bus station to support housing, leisure and commercial premises promoting enhanced connectivity” pg.45</i></p> <p><i>Rationale – “Improved linkages between heart of town centre and edge of centre retail areas; Re-use of underused land to create new homes and commercial opportunities – new activity, footfall and spend in the town centre; Scope to accommodate workspace, leisure uses close to the town centre, contributing towards retention of activity and spend; Potential to relocate the bus station to improve connectivity with the town.” Pg.53</i></p> <p><i>Timescales – procurement Q1 2024; Delivery Q2 2026 pg. 66</i></p> |

Regard should also be had to the TIP2 document which sets out further detail in respect of the aims and assumptions at the point at which the Town Investment Plan was prepared.

The scope and scale of the projects will be subject to comprehensive review following the completion of more detailed baseline analysis for example in relation to need and demand, ownerships, site conditions and highways. This will inform option testing to ensure that the proposed scheme optimises value for money within an agreed funding envelope.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| 6. Scope of Work | <p>Scope of the overall project: comprehensive, plan-led investment to secure the regeneration of key sites in support of strategic objectives to re-establish Clay Cross as a market town and promote the creation of a more vibrant and attractive town centre. The proposals will support the assembly and clearance of low quality premises to enable the creation of a market square as a focus of events, surrounded by a market facing mix of modern retail, leisure, commercial and residential accommodation. The scale of the project will be determined by deliverability and affordability criteria having particular regard to market demand and land ownership criteria. The proposals will promote enhanced connectivity through the town centre, pending the preparation of a clear transport plan for Clay Cross town centre. It is highly likely that an experienced development partner will be sought to support the delivery of the strategic objectives for the project, subject to up-front investment to de-risk the opportunity.</p> <p>Scope of the current stage: to deliver a HM Treasury Green Book compliant business case (using the template attached in Section 16) by Q1 2022. The business case will be prepared based on a project concept design developed to RIBA Stage 2, informed by relevant supporting investigations. The stage of design development will support a level of detail consistent with the Outline Business Case stage as set out within HMT guidance.¹ Supporting evidence should be appended to the business case and will be reviewed as part of the appraisal process. Within the scope of the business case commission, a range of supporting documentation will be prepared including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site ownership schedule and assembly strategy • Market demand assessment • RIBA 2 plans and concept designs • Cost assessments and financial appraisals <p>It is assumed that design development will be advanced post allocation through the procurement of a delivery partner for the scheme.</p> <p>It is noted that allowance has not been made within the scope of the business case commission for the preparation of detailed transport plans (or associated baselining) or feasibility work associated with the creation and operation of a market.</p> <p>In addition, it is confirmed that additional inputs required to advance the project to an outline planning application will not be within the scope of the current stage, though the team will engage in pre-application discussions with planning officers.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="454 1556 1410 1928"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Evidence/source</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strategic case</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change • Risks and dependencies </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Market Demand Assessment • Risk register • Stakeholder engagement plan </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economic case</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping • Economic benefit assessment • Economic costs </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping and appraisal framework </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Section | Description | Evidence/source | Strategic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change • Risks and dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Market Demand Assessment • Risk register • Stakeholder engagement plan | Economic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping • Economic benefit assessment • Economic costs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping and appraisal framework |
|------------------|--|--|-------------|-----------------|----------------|--|--|---------------|---|--|
| Section | Description | Evidence/source | | | | | | | | |
| Strategic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change • Risks and dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Market Demand Assessment • Risk register • Stakeholder engagement plan | | | | | | | | |
| Economic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping • Economic benefit assessment • Economic costs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping and appraisal framework | | | | | | | | |

¹ [Guide to developing the Project Business Case \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk/guidance/developing-a-project-business-case)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value for money Sensitivity analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost Benefit Analysis technical note |
| | Financial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project costs Funding and revenue Affordability analysis Financial risks and implications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project cost plan Financial appraisal Match-funding commitments |
| | Commercial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status and approvals Procurement strategy Commercial delivery plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project delivery plan Market demand assessment |
| | Management case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project governance Assurance and compliance Programme management Risk management Stakeholder engagement Monitoring and evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project organogram Subsidy control – legal opinion Programme/Gantt Chart Risk register Communications plan Monitoring and evaluation plan |
| | Other supporting material | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project designs (RIBA2) Site investigation report (desktop) Building surveys Planning statement and evidence of pre-app Market feasibility study Events/Activity plan Letters of support |

Subject to approval, it is envisaged that the Council will use Towns Fund investment to progress procurement of delivery partner(s) for the proposed schemes.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 7. Working Assumptions / Hypotheses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites/ Zones: no decisions have been made, the TIP advanced proposals for two phases of regeneration. While this remains the working assumption, based on an updated review of affordability, there may be a need to undertake a prioritisation exercise. Given its prominence, it is a working assumption that the Market Street site would be advanced as a priority, subject to further investigations. Scale of intervention: alongside feasibility, the affordability of proposals will be a factor in determining the potential scale of intervention. The project scope outlined within the TIP was based on a visioning exercise. The scale and configuration of the proposals should respond to updated market and site investigations to ensure that the strategy provides a robust foundation for market engagement and delivery. It is noted that a shortlist of potential options will be evaluated to establish the preferred approach. Mix of activities: initial market assessment has not identified market demand for commercial leisure activities within Clay Cross. There is expected to be demand for retail and food & drink activities, alongside some town centre housing. Housing developers have identified demand within the town centre is for flats (to rent) and market sale small starter homes. The Council is to undertake a strategic housing assessment for the area to identify housing need. Land assembly: the wider regeneration area includes a wide range of public and private interests. A clear strategy for land assembly, |
|-------------------------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| | <p>decanting and relocation needs to be created. This needs to be informed by and consider the impact on scheme costs and should be aligned with the strategic comms plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus station: the TIP outlined proposals for the relocation of the Bus Station. Based on strategic partner engagement, alongside initial affordability testing, there is a need to review and evaluate alternative options for the bus station, including for the improvement of the existing facility. Options will need to be appropriately scoped and appraised through the business case process. • Strategic highway network: issues associated with the existing highway network were identified as a priority issue for the local community through TIP stage consultation. DCC is preparing a detailed baseline model for Clay Cross which will provide the evidence for a transport plan for the town (including the town centre). However, this work has been delayed by the need to collect more data and it is not anticipated that baseline evidence (or a coherent and up-to-date transport plan) will be available within the timescales of the business plan. However, it is envisaged that project objectives will inform the scope of the transport plan and that proposals will be refined following business case approval, providing an opportunity to ensure alignment. This is aligned with the Clay Cross Connections work. • Events and activities: it is assumed that local partners will actively promote a programme of events and activities, focused around a new market square. It is envisaged that this will include market events. Further work should be commissioned to develop a strategy and test the feasibility of proposals for the re-introduction of a market in Clay Cross town centre. • Delivery mechanisms: no mechanism has yet been agreed, but it is envisaged that local partners will seek a private sector development partner to advance the delivery of the scheme, in accordance with agreed parameters. It is assumed that the development partner will secure commercial funding. This approach assumes that the Board and Council will advance up-front interventions to de-risk the development. This will include assembling the site and securing an outline planning consent. • Monitoring and evaluation: as an exemplar initiative, resource should be made available for effective monitoring, evaluation and the dissemination of best practice. |
| 8. Key dependencies | <p>The availability of an appropriate funding envelope to support the scale of intervention needed to catalyse change within Clay Cross town centre</p> <p>Securing the assembly of land interests through negotiated purchase or other arrangements (to be determined)</p> <p>Subject to detailed ground investigations</p> <p>Demonstrating the feasibility of a proposed market operation within Clay Cross town centre</p> <p>Aligning with strategic NEDDC strategies</p> <p>Preparing and submitting a satisfactory business case (and supporting evidence) within the timescales for TF allocations</p> <p>Aligning with an emerging transport plan for Clay Cross town centre</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | <p>Securing planning approvals</p> <p>Identifying and securing a development partner (and private sector investment) on acceptable terms</p> <p>Securing investor/occupier demand for proposed scheme</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------------|--|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|----|----|----|--|-------|-------|-------|--|-------|--------|--------|--|---|-----|-----|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|---|--|--|-----|--------------------|--|--|-----|
| 9. Outputs | <p>The outputs and outcomes identified for each zone within the TIP are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Market St</th> <th>Bridge St</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outputs</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>New sustainable commercial floorspace (m²)</td> <td>3,100</td> <td>1,700</td> <td>4,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New sustainable homes</td> <td>40</td> <td>40</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New or improved public realm (m²)</td> <td>5,000</td> <td>2,000</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land brought back into use (m²)</td> <td>2,500</td> <td>20,000</td> <td>22,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enhanced linkages across town centre (m)</td> <td>-</td> <td>200</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcomes</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increased land values across the sites/wider town centre</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>TBC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enhanced resident, business and visitor perceptions</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>TBC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increased footfall</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>TBC</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The scope of the town centre regeneration project and deliverable outputs will be subject to further appraisal informed by more detailed baseline analysis and viability testing.</p> <p>However, as required by MHGLG (following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the 'in principle' funding award), the following mandatory outputs <u>must</u> be collected/ reported annually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners) • Co-funding (£) committed (private and public) • Co-funding (£) spent on project delivery (private and public) • Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects <i>Target of 100no. from Bridge Street site</i> • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects • New sustainable commercial floorspace <i>Target of 3,100 sqm on Market St & 1,700 sqm on Bridge St</i> • Number of residential units provided <i>Target of 80no. split evenly across both sites</i> • Amount of public realm improved <i>Target of 5,000 sqm from Market St site & 2,000 sqm from Bridge St site</i> • Amount of rehabilitated land <i>Target of 2,500 sqm Market St site and 20,000sqm (2ha) Bridge St</i> <p>Projected outputs will continue to be reported to the Town Board as design development progresses.</p> | Indicator | Market St | Bridge St | Total | Outputs | | | | New sustainable commercial floorspace (m ²) | 3,100 | 1,700 | 4,800 | New sustainable homes | 40 | 40 | 80 | New or improved public realm (m ²) | 5,000 | 2,000 | 7,000 | Land brought back into use (m ²) | 2,500 | 20,000 | 22,500 | Enhanced linkages across town centre (m) | - | 200 | 200 | Outcomes | | | | Increased land values across the sites/wider town centre | | | TBC | Enhanced resident, business and visitor perceptions | | | TBC | Increased footfall | | | TBC |
| Indicator | Market St | Bridge St | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outputs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New sustainable commercial floorspace (m ²) | 3,100 | 1,700 | 4,800 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New sustainable homes | 40 | 40 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New or improved public realm (m ²) | 5,000 | 2,000 | 7,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land brought back into use (m ²) | 2,500 | 20,000 | 22,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Enhanced linkages across town centre (m) | - | 200 | 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcomes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increased land values across the sites/wider town centre | | | TBC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Enhanced resident, business and visitor perceptions | | | TBC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increased footfall | | | TBC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | Potential outcomes will be scoped and estimated to inform the cost benefit analysis as part of a Green Book compliant option appraisal. Projections will be identified within a benefit realisation plan and aligned with the monitoring and evaluation plan prepared in respect of the proposed option. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|--|--|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------|--|---|----|-----|---|------|
| 10. Costs | <p>An indicative cost profile was set out in respect of each scheme within the TIP.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="454 387 1374 555"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Market St</th> <th colspan="2">Bridge St</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th>(£million)</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th>2022/23</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Towns Fund</td> <td></td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>9.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Match/co-funding</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>10</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4</td> <td>19.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business case stage costs: at this stage it is not anticipated that further drawdown of funding will be required to fund the business case. The proposals will need to be supported by robust evidence and resource has been allocated within the business case procurement for concept design development to RIBA 2. As highlighted elsewhere, there is considered to be a strong case for securing additional supporting evidence in relation to: (i) the existing highway network and transport infrastructure, (ii) the feasibility of a proposed market operation, and (iii) establishing a strategy for events and activities to build demand for leisure and related uses. These elements lie outside of the business case scope. Public sector match funding: indicative financial appraisals (based on standard benchmark rates for land and construction costs) at the TIP stage identified a total public sector funding requirement of £11.5 million, including £2.5 million of other public funding. The source of this funding was not explicitly stated at the TIP stage, reflecting the early concept nature of the proposals. Potential opportunities to secure match funding (including land assets and in-kind contributions) to support strategic regeneration objectives will continue to be reviewed. Private sector match funding: the estimate of private sector match (£17 million) was informed by a high level estimate of scheme value, assuming a partner led delivery strategy. This will continue to be evaluated as proposals are refined, informed by the site and market analyses. Cost profile: the profile outlined above has been pushed back a year to allow for the time required to advance the scheme to business case. Subject to further project scoping, it is envisaged that the profile of expenditure will continue to be refined, with investment in the initial period linked to land assembly and the creation of a development platform. <p>The financial profile will continue to be reviewed and re-evaluated in light of scoping and site appraisal plan.</p> | | | Market St | | Bridge St | | | (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total | Towns Fund | | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 9.0 | Match/co-funding | | 1 | 10 | 4.5 | 4 | 19.5 |
| | | Market St | | Bridge St | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Towns Fund | | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 9.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Match/co-funding | | 1 | 10 | 4.5 | 4 | 19.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

11. Teams Roles

Business Case team:

| Partner | Lead | Role |
|-------------------|--|---|
| AMION: | Peter Alford and Graham Russell | Coordinate business case and manage the project team Lead option scoping and long-list appraisal Cost benefit analysis for shortlisted project options Lead drafting the business case |
| NEDDC: | Karl Apps, Project Director | Team coordination Support land assembly strategy Commission additional research needed to inform the business case Working Group and wider stakeholder engagement |
| | Maria Curran | PMO & regeneration support |
| | Tony Kimber Interim Head of Property | Support land assembly strategy |
| Buttress: | Martin Kirkpatrick | Site appraisal work – desk top review Coordinate baseline work Masterplan – option development |
| Thomas Lister: | Rachel Lister | Market assessment Prepare initial ownership schedule and liaise with site owners/occupiers Financial appraisal of proposals Engagement with development partners |
| Edge: | Geoff Tinsley | Cost assessment |
| Ramboll: | Ed Kerr | Strategic advice in relation to infrastructure and transport |
| Nexus: | Pete Tooher | Planning strategy Partner engagement / coordination |

Wider project team

| Partner | Lead | Role |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| NEDDC Economic Development | Gill Callingham | SRO/Chair |
| | Bryan Harrison | Regeneration & urban design support Link with other WGs |
| NEDDC Planning | Adrian Kirkham Graeme Cooper Helen Fairfax | Guide planning strategy for scheme Wider planning framework for Clay Cross town centre |
| DCC Highways and transport | Chris Hegarty Ian Turkington Dean Jones | Highway and transport survey data Bus Station relocation Active travel data for Clay Cross Guide project scoping |
| Stagecoach Yorkshire | John Young Commercial Director | Bus Station, bus journey times and operational issues |
| NEDDC/DCC Estates | Gareth Harper Jo Hollick | Baseline data for NEDDC / DCC assets Occupier relocation/decant strategy |

Version_1.0

PMO

Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St

17/09/21

| | NEDDC Finance | Jayne Dethick S151 Officer | Overview of financial proposals Confirmation of match-funding (cash, assets, in-kind) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|------|------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--|---------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|---------------|--|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------|---|--|-----------|---|---------------|---|---------------|---|--|--------|---|---|-------------|---|---------------------------------|---------|--|
| | NEDDC/DCC procurement & legal services | Sandy Williams, Joan Talbot and Cory Walters | Procurement and compliance Subsidy control advice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Workplan | <p>Outputs and Timeline:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Task</th> <th>Date</th> <th>Lead/role/responsibilities</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Site ownership schedule</td> <td>July 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of baseline information and updated analysis using on-line resources - TL </td> </tr> <tr> <td>July 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land registry data - NEDDC </td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Market assessment – Demand analysis</td> <td>August 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated market assessment report including schedule of key issues for option scoping – TL (complete) </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aug – Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial soft market testing with potential delivery partners – TL (on-going) </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Initial scoping appraisal</td> <td>August - Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of cost and value assumptions underpinning indicative proposals set out within the Town Investment Plan - Team </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Baseline/Site Investigations (desktop report)</td> <td>Aug - Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk-top review of site conditions and infrastructure/services – Ramboll Photographic survey of existing buildings – Buttress/NEDDC Summary report – Ramboll/Buttress </td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Baseline analysis - Transport, highways, parking and active travel</td> <td>August 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing baseline information, identify gaps in data and provide guidance to secure requisite survey information – Ramboll </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aug – Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with key stakeholders including Stagecoach – Ramboll </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aug - Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalise brief(s) for further survey work if required to better inform baseline assessment Surveys commissioned and reporting – NEDDC/DCC/AMION Establish design parameters for design brief in respect of proposed development zones </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Explore opportunity to develop an Events and Activity plan</td> <td>Oct 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with stakeholders within NEDDC, DCC and First Arts to scope and develop Strategy - NEDDC </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design brief and option scoping framework</td> <td>Sept-Oct 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a clear schedule of objectives and key design principles and high level landscape strategy aligned to baseline review/wider masterplanning for strategic interventions – NEDDC/AMION Finalise design brief – NEDDC Initial option scoping framework outlining long-list options and appraisal criteria – AMION / Team </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site assembly - high level plan</td> <td>Sept 21</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full schedule of interests – TL/NEDDC Estimate of value – NEDDC/TL Relocation opportunities – NEDDC/TL Engagement plan – Nexus/TL </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | Task | Date | Lead/role/responsibilities | Site ownership schedule | July 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of baseline information and updated analysis using on-line resources - TL | July 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land registry data - NEDDC | Market assessment – Demand analysis | August 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated market assessment report including schedule of key issues for option scoping – TL (complete) | Aug – Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial soft market testing with potential delivery partners – TL (on-going) | Initial scoping appraisal | August - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of cost and value assumptions underpinning indicative proposals set out within the Town Investment Plan - Team | Baseline/Site Investigations (desktop report) | Aug - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk-top review of site conditions and infrastructure/services – Ramboll Photographic survey of existing buildings – Buttress/NEDDC Summary report – Ramboll/Buttress | Baseline analysis - Transport, highways, parking and active travel | August 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing baseline information, identify gaps in data and provide guidance to secure requisite survey information – Ramboll | Aug – Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with key stakeholders including Stagecoach – Ramboll | Aug - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalise brief(s) for further survey work if required to better inform baseline assessment Surveys commissioned and reporting – NEDDC/DCC/AMION Establish design parameters for design brief in respect of proposed development zones | Explore opportunity to develop an Events and Activity plan | Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with stakeholders within NEDDC, DCC and First Arts to scope and develop Strategy - NEDDC | Design brief and option scoping framework | Sept-Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a clear schedule of objectives and key design principles and high level landscape strategy aligned to baseline review/wider masterplanning for strategic interventions – NEDDC/AMION Finalise design brief – NEDDC Initial option scoping framework outlining long-list options and appraisal criteria – AMION / Team | Site assembly - high level plan | Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full schedule of interests – TL/NEDDC Estimate of value – NEDDC/TL Relocation opportunities – NEDDC/TL Engagement plan – Nexus/TL |
| Task | Date | Lead/role/responsibilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site ownership schedule | July 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of baseline information and updated analysis using on-line resources - TL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | July 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land registry data - NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Market assessment – Demand analysis | August 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated market assessment report including schedule of key issues for option scoping – TL (complete) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Aug – Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial soft market testing with potential delivery partners – TL (on-going) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Initial scoping appraisal | August - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of cost and value assumptions underpinning indicative proposals set out within the Town Investment Plan - Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline/Site Investigations (desktop report) | Aug - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk-top review of site conditions and infrastructure/services – Ramboll Photographic survey of existing buildings – Buttress/NEDDC Summary report – Ramboll/Buttress | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline analysis - Transport, highways, parking and active travel | August 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing baseline information, identify gaps in data and provide guidance to secure requisite survey information – Ramboll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Aug – Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with key stakeholders including Stagecoach – Ramboll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Aug - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalise brief(s) for further survey work if required to better inform baseline assessment Surveys commissioned and reporting – NEDDC/DCC/AMION Establish design parameters for design brief in respect of proposed development zones | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Explore opportunity to develop an Events and Activity plan | Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with stakeholders within NEDDC, DCC and First Arts to scope and develop Strategy - NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Design brief and option scoping framework | Sept-Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a clear schedule of objectives and key design principles and high level landscape strategy aligned to baseline review/wider masterplanning for strategic interventions – NEDDC/AMION Finalise design brief – NEDDC Initial option scoping framework outlining long-list options and appraisal criteria – AMION / Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site assembly - high level plan | Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full schedule of interests – TL/NEDDC Estimate of value – NEDDC/TL Relocation opportunities – NEDDC/TL Engagement plan – Nexus/TL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPO process overview – Nexus/TL | |
| | Draft Strategic Case | Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft section circulated for comment – AMION | |
| | Project plans - RIBA 2 concept (first draft) and option scoping | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RIBA 2 plans for preferred option • Basic plans for alternative intervention options • Develop the short-list of options in parallel with the design process – AMION/team • Scope delivery options – TL/wider team • Assume further rounds of updates following engagement/financial appraisal | |
| | Initial Cost plan | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft cost plans for preferred and alternative options - Edge | |
| | Engagement | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with local stakeholders/community – Nexus • Market testing – TL | |
| | Financial appraisal | Nov 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development appraisals for preferred and alternative options – TL • Funding strategy and appraisal – TL/AMION | |
| | Project plans - RIBA 2 concept (amended draft) and option scoping | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further updates following engagement/ financial appraisal, concluding with recommended preferred option. • Update short-list of options and identify a preferred option in parallel with the design process | |
| | WG consideration of options and preferred option | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEDDC/AMION/ Buttress | |
| | Board Approval of preferred option | Jan 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEDDC | |
| | Draft Economic Case | Dec – Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost benefit analysis – AMION • Draft economic case circulated for comment - AMION | |
| | Project delivery plan | Dec – Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline procurement strategy – NEDDC/AMION & TL • Project delivery plan – NEDDC/AMION • Risk management plan – NEDDC | |
| | Draft Management Case | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft section circulated for comment – NEDDC/AMION | |
| | Draft Commercial Case | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft section circulated for comment - AMION based on PDP | |
| | Draft Financial Case | Dec 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft section circulated for comment – AMION/TL | |
| | Draft Business Case WG Check & Challenge | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present Draft Business Case for approval & recommendation to Board | |
| | Final Business Case | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMION | |
| | Business Case Assurance | Jan 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEDDC | |
| | Board Approval | TBC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEDDC | |
| 13. Risk | Key risks drawn from the outline risk register: | | | |
| | Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations |
| | Business objectives | Failure to define and meet clear objectives | Medium /High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree clear objectives at an early stage in the option scoping process |
| | | | | Status |
| | | | | Open |

Version_1.0


PMO

Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St

17/09/21

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|--------------|--|------|
| | | for the project aligned to the TIP | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set a clear design brief in light of updated baseline | |
| | Land ownerships | Risk that the Council is unable to identify / secure third party interests needed for redevelopment | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare a schedule of interests for the site, identifying owner/title information Develop a clear engagement and land assembly strategy Develop occupier relocation strategy Consider CPO | Open |
| | Land acquisition | Risk that purchase and compensation costs are not affordable within the scope of the funding allocation | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out appropriate valuations to inform budget appraisal Proactive engagement to understand value expectation | Open |
| | Highways | Risk that the impact on highways/ transport is deemed to be unacceptable. Time needed to undertake further studies takes longer than anticipated and delays the options stage. | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish highways technical Task & Finish Group and clearly defined Terms of Reference as a priority. Review existing baseline information to confirm assessment of need and commission further transport survey work to better inform the baseline and likely cost of options. Design brief to include for use of appropriate tools (e.g. Early Assessment & Sifting Tool [EAST]) to provide relevant, high level information to help form an early view of how options perform and compare. High-level transport/ junction modelling of short-listed options to better understand impact | Open |
| | Planning | Risk that the scheme proposals do not secure planning consent | Medium /High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare a clear planning strategy for the scheme Early engagement with planners | Open |
| | Ground conditions | The risk that ground conditions / services may restrict development or increase costs | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A phase/stage 1 environmental survey will need to be instructed to assess these risks | Open |
| | Viability challenges | The risk that the level of funding secured through TF is insufficient to address the scale of the viability gap | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress project cost refinement Option testing Engagement with potential partners | Open |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|---|------|
| | Match funding | The risk that that level of match funding is insufficient to support the objectives for the site | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity for NEDDC funding to be explored Engagement with funding and delivery partners to be carried out Funding strategy to be prepared | Open |
| 14. Comms / consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication assumption: A clear plan for communications will be critical for this project given sensitivities around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the prominence of the scheme in previous rounds of communication; community feedback in consultation undertaken to date identifying town centre regeneration as a strategic priority; sensitivities relating to third party interests; the potential delivery strategy, under which a private sector partner would be procured to develop detailed plans for the scheme. <p>The approach to communications will need to be clear from the outset, highlighting the strategic objectives and scope of the project. The approach should ensure that the risk of misalignment of expectations within the community is minimised.</p> Consultation assumption: a two stage community consultation process was undertaken to inform the development of the TIP. The Working Group has highlighted the importance of sustaining community consultation. Reflecting the points outlined above, the focus of community consultation at this stage should be around strategic objectives and scope. Targeted stakeholder consultation is progressing, focused around soft-market testing and engagement with landowners. | | | | |
| 15. Assumed Business As Usual Status (BAU) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BAU case assumes that strategic regeneration will not take place in the short to medium term in the absence of intervention. Development and refurbishment projects within the town centre will be advanced on a piecemeal basis, subject to market investment. Given the declining condition of town centre assets, alongside strategic challenges within key market sectors, it is envisaged that this will result in the ongoing deterioration of the traditional town centre (A61 corridor and Market Street). Over time, it is envisaged that sites will be advanced for residential led development. | | | | |
| 16. Business Case stage deliverable |  <p>Clay Cross Business Case Template.docx</p> | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross A&B: Market St & Bridge St | 17/09/21 |

RAIL STATION FEASIBILITY STUDY: COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Rail Station Feasibility Study Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses / working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed business case to CLG by Q3 2022.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Type of feasibility study to be produced:** given the lack of an open New Stations Fund-type programme by the Department for Transport (DfT), it is not physically possible to conclude the full feasibility process on this proposal (as to do so would require DfT inputs, review from DfT civil servants, likely DfT match funding etc.). As a result, the scope of this initiative has been defined as the creation of a written document, which would cover submission of a proposal for the first stage of that process [known as a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC)]. This is the furthest that the initiative can get without an open New Stations Fund-type process and full DfT involvement.
 2. **Cost:** as a result of the above recommendation, it is possible that this project will not cost the full allocation of £200,000. The project wishes to retain the allocated Town Deal funds for now as costs could change as further work is undertaken. Any underspend can be reallocated to other projects, with MHCLG approval, at an appropriate point when costs are more certain.
- **Key working assumptions:** none to report at this stage.
- **Procurement:** the Working Group recommends procuring a consultant to begin work on SOBC as soon as is practical. To align with MHCLG requirements, a Strategic Assessment will be produced at the earliest opportunity to seek approval to draw down the funds. Simultaneously, it is proposed to progress the process for appointing a consultant. A draft procurement brief has been created by officers and, following agreement with the NEDDC procurement team, the process of appointment will be started whilst the Strategic Assessment is being agreed with MHCLG.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- **notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;**
- **notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;**
- **acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;**
- **endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.**

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal board on (date to be confirmed) which will primarily focus on providing more detail around (i) the full scope of the study based on the final brief agreed by the Working Group (ii) updates on the procurement process and (iii) the expected cost of the study based on market testing. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;
- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Lee Rowley, Chair of the Working Group (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Martyn Handley, NEDDC, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by Gill Callingham, Director of Growth NEDDC who, based on this early stage of the proposal development, deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Project name | Rail Station Feasibility Study |
| 2. Project aim | <p>Summary aim of overall project: To complete a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC), to the most practically detailed level possible, on re-opening a railway station in / near Clay Cross</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: to produce an interim “Strategic Assessment” document and to begin the procurement process for appointing a consultant to create the SOBC, which will allow Town Deal funding to be released for the full Strategic Outline Business Case.</p> |
| 3. Project description / initial considerations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clay Cross railway station, located at Station New Road in Tupton, closed in 1967 and the town has been without a direct link to the Midland Mainline / Erewash Valley lines since then. Residents wishing to use the train either must travel to Chesterfield or elsewhere. • There has been a long-standing aspiration to re-open a station in Clay Cross for a number of decades and previous masterplans / strategic frameworks (e.g. Clay Cross Regeneration Framework, 2013) have all recorded this ambition. No detailed work has been undertaken in recent years nor, until now, has any practical process been identified to undertake that more detailed consideration. Other track considerations have also slowed progress in recent years – including HS2 effectively freezing any new development on the line until it is clear what is happening with that project. • This project does not have the specific aim of re-opening the station itself given the continuing wider considerations of HS2 and the Integrated Rail Plan. In addition, it should be stated that it cannot conclude a full business case process, for both cost and practical purposes – specifically that a 3-stage business case process requires input from the Department for Transport as part of a wider “New Stations Fund” type programme. There is no current DfT process open which would prevent the relevant checkpoint reviews being done. Instead, this project aims to produce a document which could be submitted to cover the first stage of that process at the point when it next opens for consideration. • The project was identified, in discussion with MHCLG, as one that could potentially be expedited. The Working Group have, therefore, looked as to how timelines could be brought forward to respond to that request. |
| 4. Definitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railway station: defined as a passenger railway station providing scheduled passenger services • “Clay Cross”: for the purposes of this document, it is accepted that the area under consideration may be wider than that covered by the Town Deal (primarily to enable consideration of sites such as the old Clay Cross Railway station in Tupton). • Strategic Assessment: document which will be prepared to release funds for the consultant to be employed to create the SOBC. This Strategic Assessment will be a high-level document which covers the local context, the study objectives, the study goals and the procurement process (and how to expedite the output). |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 5. TIP Stage Assumptions | <p>The TIP recorded the following assumptions on this initiative when submitted to CLG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Rail Station – this project will explore the feasibility of re-establishing a rail station to serve the town and wider area” (p.6 /8)</i> • <i>“Commissioning detailed work to investigate the feasibility of re-instating a train station within Clay Cross” (p.45)</i> • <i>“Planning for a Railway Station – this may take some years to realise, but it would be important to begin planning for this now” (p.57)</i> • <i>“Delivery Programme: Q4 2021 Business Case development, Q1 – Q3 2022 Feasibility concept design” (p.66)</i> |
| 6. Scope of Delivery | <p>Scope of overall project: to deliver a Strategic Outline Business Case, using the established template which has previously been required from the DfT for a new stations application, which would enable a submission at the point a “New Stations”-type Fund opens. Subsequent business case stages, and any final build / construction / project costs will be dealt with by a future project / initiative. This SOBC document will be delivered by Q3 2022.</p> <p>Scope of current stage: to produce an interim “Strategic Assessment” document, which will allow funding to be released for the full Strategic Outline Business Case. This document will cover, at a high-level, (i) the local context, (ii) the study objectives, (iii) the study goals, (iv) the procurement process and (v) how to expedite the output.</p> |
| 7. Working Assumptions / Hypotheses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location: no decisions have been made on site location but the Working Group is aware of a number of potential options (a safeguarded site on the Egstow Park development and the old station location in Tupton). The work associated with the delivery of the SOBC would expect to highlight a preferred site, subject to that being possible, albeit with a clear caveat that it would be pending further investigation at later stages • Wider strategic rail context: it is unlikely that the wider context around HS2 / Integrated Rail Plan will be resolved in a timeline which fully works for the delivery of this SOBC. Thus, where it is necessary to do so, the SOBC will ring-fence off these considerations in order to progress with this project • Type: the specified aim of this project is the delivery of a station for heavy rail. The SOBC (or an associated document) should offer a clear, written statement about why light rail is not feasible in this context – and no further work should be undertaken on this point beyond that • Historic Strategic Statements: that the project has taken account of documents such as the Clay Cross Regeneration Framework (2013) and is in line with its aims and recommendations. • Area of Focus: it has been confirmed by MHCLG that they are happy for the area of focus for the project to be wider than the agreed Town Deal area, as long as Clay Cross residents are a beneficiary. • Procurement: due to the project being recommended as a Fast Track project as part of the TIP, the Working Group has agreed that an expedited Procurement process is recommended, with the actual appointment of |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

| | the consultants to be managed by NEDDC Procurement team to ensure best value for money. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|----------|----------------|---------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|------|
| 8. Key Dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wider strategic rail context regarding HS2 / IRP / Northern Powerhouse / Restoring Your Rail (to be referenced where necessary but ring-fenced off where appropriate) • The procurement of suitable delivery partners for the construction of an SOBC • Willingness to engage from key stakeholders such as Network Rail, Department for Transport etc. • Understanding of other transport initiatives in Clay Cross to work out how best to integrate a future railway station at the location which is eventually proposed by the SOBC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Outputs | <p>The following outputs are assumed at the conclusion of the project:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outputs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strategic Outline Business Case</td> <td>1 document</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A Land Value Capture Report</td> <td>1 document</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Any associated additional documents (such as disregard of light rail or equivalent) which are created as part of the SOBC development or can be created at this time to assist the success of future funding bids</td> <td>As determined by the project team</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the ‘in principle’ funding award, MHGLG now requires the following mandatory outputs to be collected/ reported annually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners) • Co-funding committed (private and public) • Co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public) • Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects <p>Further detail about outputs will be provided at a subsequent iteration of this document.</p> | Indicator | Quantity | Outputs | | Strategic Outline Business Case | 1 document | A Land Value Capture Report | 1 document | Any associated additional documents (such as disregard of light rail or equivalent) which are created as part of the SOBC development or can be created at this time to assist the success of future funding bids | As determined by the project team | | | | |
| Indicator | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outputs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strategic Outline Business Case | 1 document | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A Land Value Capture Report | 1 document | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Any associated additional documents (such as disregard of light rail or equivalent) which are created as part of the SOBC development or can be created at this time to assist the success of future funding bids | As determined by the project team | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Costs | <p>The following high-level assumptions around costs have been made:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>(£million)</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th>2022/23</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Towns Fund</td> <td></td> <td>0.15</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total | Towns Fund | | 0.15 | | | | 0.15 |
| (£million) | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Total | | | | | | | | | |
| Towns Fund | | 0.15 | | | | 0.15 | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

| | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Match/co-funding</td> <td></td> <td>0.05</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.05</td> </tr> </table> | Match/co-funding | | 0.05 | | | | 0.05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|------|------|--------|--------------|--|----------|---------|---------------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------------|---------|------|------|-------|----------------|--|--------------|-----|-----------|------------------------------|--|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Match/co-funding | | 0.05 | | | | 0.05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Team Roles | <p>The business case team will primarily comprise the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Lead</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AMION:</td> <td>Peter Alford</td> <td>Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ramboll:</td> <td>Ed Kerr</td> <td>Scoping feasibility study brief</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nexus:</td> <td>Pete Tooher</td> <td>Partner engagement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The wider Working Group, who still steer the project between reports to the Town Board, comprise the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Lead</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">NEDDC</td> <td>Martyn Handley</td> <td>Lead NEDDC inputs and support coordination of wider inputs Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maria Curran</td> <td>PMO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karl Apps</td> <td>Head of Economic Development</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>Cllr Alex Dale</td> <td>Leader of Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Charlotte Cupit</td> <td>Deputy Leader of Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Clay Cross Town Deal</td> <td>Lee Rowley MP</td> <td>Chair of Working Group, Project Board Sponsor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gary Golden</td> <td>Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Carolyn Renwick</td> <td>Vice-Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Derbyshire County Council</td> <td>Allison Westray-Chapman</td> <td>Head of Economic Development</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Partner | Lead | Role | AMION: | Peter Alford | Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements | Ramboll: | Ed Kerr | Scoping feasibility study brief | Nexus: | Pete Tooher | Partner engagement | Partner | Lead | Role | NEDDC | Martyn Handley | Lead NEDDC inputs and support coordination of wider inputs Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG | Maria Curran | PMO | Karl Apps | Head of Economic Development | | Cllr Alex Dale | Leader of Council | Cllr Charlotte Cupit | Deputy Leader of Council | Clay Cross Town Deal | Lee Rowley MP | Chair of Working Group, Project Board Sponsor | Gary Golden | Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board | Cllr Carolyn Renwick | Vice-Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board | Derbyshire County Council | Allison Westray-Chapman | Head of Economic Development |
| Partner | Lead | Role | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMION: | Peter Alford | Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ramboll: | Ed Kerr | Scoping feasibility study brief | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nexus: | Pete Tooher | Partner engagement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Partner | Lead | Role | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEDDC | Martyn Handley | Lead NEDDC inputs and support coordination of wider inputs Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Maria Curran | PMO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Karl Apps | Head of Economic Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cllr Alex Dale | Leader of Council | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cllr Charlotte Cupit | Deputy Leader of Council | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clay Cross Town Deal | Lee Rowley MP | Chair of Working Group, Project Board Sponsor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Gary Golden | Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cllr Carolyn Renwick | Vice-Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Derbyshire County Council | Allison Westray-Chapman | Head of Economic Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | Ian Turkington | Highways and Transport |
| | Chris Hegarty | Highways and Transport |
| Clay Cross Parish Council | Cllr Ted Mansbridge | |
| HS2 | Michael Haughton | |
| Network Rail | Robert Russell | |
| | Maria Clayton | |
| | Richard Joslin | |
| Department for Transport | Samantha Goodey | |
| East Midlands Railways | David Jackson | |

The overall owner of this project is, from a Working Group perspective, Lee Rowley (as Chair of the Working Group) and Martyn Handley as the appointed officer to lead. Both are ultimately responsible for the output and practical achievability of the proposal.

12. Workplan

The current working assumptions around the timeline of the business case are the following:

| Task | Date | Lead/role/responsibilities |
|--|---------------|---|
| Determine funding approval requirements | July – Aug 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MHCLG engagement – AMION S151 Officer engagement – NEDDC Agree local assurance requirements – NEDDC |
| Prepare Tender Brief for Study based on WG agreed objectives. Determine the procurement route | Aug - Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine compliant procurement route - NEDDC Identify potential suppliers – NEDDC/ AMION |
| Produce a draft Strategic Assessment for review | Sept 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION |
| Working Group review of tender brief and Strategic Assessment | Sept - Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |
| Board approval of tender action | By email | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |
| Procure consultancy to undertake the Feasibility Study | Sept – Oct 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC |

Version_1.0

PMO

Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study

17/09/21

| | Finalise Strategic Assessment based on tender price | Oct – Nov 21 | • AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------|--|-----------|-------------|--------|-------------|--------|----------|--|--------|--|------|------------------|---|--------|--|------|----------------|---|--------------|---|------|--------------|---|--------------|--|------|
| | Strategic Assessment appraised by external assurance | Nov 21 | • Respond to queries - NEDDC/AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Board Approval of Strategic Assessment for submission to MHCLG | Nov 21 | • NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Consultant appointed | Nov-Dec 21 | • NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>The high-level indicative delivery plan for the project as a whole is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q4: appointment of consultant to create SOBC / other documents • Q1 – Q3: creation of SOBC / other documents • Q1: commencement of 1st consultation • Q3: sign-off, approval of output documents • Q3: closure of project <p>These timelines have not been validated at this stage and should be seen as highly indicative / subject to change.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Risk | <p>The following key risks have been identified:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Risk name</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Rating</th> <th>Mitigations</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Business</td> <td>Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study</td> <td>Medium</td> <td>• Established clear objectives through the Working Group that are clearly aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Procurement risk</td> <td>Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study</td> <td>Medium</td> <td>• Carry out initial market testing • Tender via a robust open procurement process</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Programme risk</td> <td>Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF</td> <td>Medium /High</td> <td>• Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Funding risk</td> <td>Risk that match funding cannot be sourced</td> <td>Medium /High</td> <td>• Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions)</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status | Business | Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study | Medium | • Established clear objectives through the Working Group that are clearly aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross | Open | Procurement risk | Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study | Medium | • Carry out initial market testing • Tender via a robust open procurement process | Open | Programme risk | Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF | Medium /High | • Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule | Open | Funding risk | Risk that match funding cannot be sourced | Medium /High | • Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions) | Open |
| Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business | Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study | Medium | • Established clear objectives through the Working Group that are clearly aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross | Open | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procurement risk | Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study | Medium | • Carry out initial market testing • Tender via a robust open procurement process | Open | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme risk | Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF | Medium /High | • Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule | Open | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Funding risk | Risk that match funding cannot be sourced | Medium /High | • Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions) | Open | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Communication / consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication assumption: Given that the project has both been identified for rapid progression and the level of interest within the community, we would expect regular communications to be issued for residents on this project. Those communications will need to be clear, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>from the beginning, about the scope of the project (essentially “getting us ready for when we can bid”) so there is no misalignment within the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation assumption: the Working Group is keen to run a high-level initial consultation, perhaps regarding location, at an early stage. This will be put into the procurement brief for the appointed consultants to undertake. Then also a further consultation will be undertaken once the SOBC has been drafted. |
| 15. Assumed Business As Usual Status (BAU) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that this project seeks to deliver a Strategic Outline Business Case only, there is no definition required of the BAU status • Once completed, the project will be wound down and the SOBC will await the opening of a New Stations-type fund for, hopefully, minimal amendment and submission into such a process. The timelines for the opening of the next NSF-type fund are unclear at this stage. |
| 16. Business Case stage deliverable | Intentionally blank |

| | |
|--|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study | 17/09/21 |

CLAY CROSS SKILLS AND ENTERPRISE HUB: COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Clay Cross Skills Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal Board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses/working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed business case to MHCLG by March 2022.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Reprofiling of costs:** the original Town Investment Plan envisaged the spend in the FY 2021/22 and FY 2022/23. Given the time it will take to agree, procure and mobilise this project, the spend profile has been rolled forward into FY 2022/23 and FY 2023/24
 2. **Outputs:** at this stage the high-level objectives outlined for the project remain the same, however further work will be undertaken to verify/confirm that the scale of the proposed outcomes (in particular the number of learners assisted) for the project are realistic and it is likely that the Working Group may propose alternatives in the future.
- **Key working assumptions:** no decisions have yet been taken but the chosen focus of the Working Group will inevitably mean that some outputs become more likely than others. The current focus remains on delivering the key objectives described in the TIP related to the refurbishment/ reconfiguration/ extension of the existing Clay Cross Adult Education Centre ('AEC') to provide a Skills and Enterprise Hub for key employers in the area, SMEs and a learning resource for local residents.

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;
- notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;
- acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;
- endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal Board (date to be confirmed), which will primarily focus on

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

providing more detail around (i) the skills and enterprise offer (ii) an indication of the size of any additional extension needed to the existing AEC and (iii) the proposed operating model. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;
- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Jane Weston, Chair of the Working Group (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Karl Apps, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by Gill Callingham, Director of Growth NEDDC who, based on this early stage of the proposal development, deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Project name | Skills & Enterprise Hub |
| 2. Project aim | <p>Summary aim of the overall project: To deliver a Skills and Enterprise Hub offering new and refurbished space for skills, training and enterprise – for key employers in the area (including Worcester Bosch); SMEs; and a learning resource for residents, focused initially on Clay Cross residents.</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: To develop a Green Book compliant business case to secure funding through the Town Investment Fund to support a Skills and Enterprise Hub.</p> |
| 3. Project description/initial considerations | <p>The project emerged from baseline analysis undertaken to inform the TIP which highlighted low educational attainment and qualification rates within the local population. For example, the analysis noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational attainment in Clay Cross was lagging behind the England average. In 2019 56% achieved A-C in English and Maths compared with 65% nationally and the attainment 8 score was lower at 42.6% compared with 46.7%; • NE Derbyshire has a lower proportion of residents with higher skilled qualifications compared with the national average 33.8% vs 40.2%; and • There is poor social mobility at the district level with North East Derbyshire ranked 268 out of 324 local authorities. The area is identified as a ‘coldspot’ (1=best performing LA). <p>As the enhancement of skills and enterprise is a key objective of the Towns Fund, the Skills & Enterprise Hub was proposed as a means of aligning the existing skills offer with new provision, delivered by potential partners including established FE/HE providers.</p> |
| 4. Definitions | Skills and Enterprise Hub – at the time of submission, the TIP assumed that the hub would be providing both Skills support for Employers and Residents, in addition to a small amount of ‘workspace’ for new enterprises. |
| 5. TIP Stage Assumptions | <p>The TIP recorded the following assumptions on this initiative when submitted to CLG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [the delivery of] “Clay Cross Training, Learning and Enterprise Hub – this will comprise new and refurbished space for skills, training and enterprise – providing a hub for key employers in the area (including Worcester Bosch); SMEs and a learning resource for local residents;” (p.6) • “Description: Shared platform for establishing an integrated skills and enterprise offer, based on collaborative working between public and private providers” (p.45) • “Rationale: * High unemployment, low educational attainment, low levels of social mobility and aspirations * Lower productivity and high proportion of lower value added jobs * Skills support access to employment opportunities, new and existing businesses development and enhanced productivity * Demand led training to improve competitiveness of the business base” (p.53) • “Outputs: * New training opportunities provided – digital skills and employer led * Provision of workspace for microenterprises” (p.53) • “Outcomes / indicators: * New learners becoming job ready * Unemployed people assisted * Increased wages * Improved productivity” (p.53) |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Delivery programme: Feasibility Concept design: Q1 2021, Business case development: Q2 – Q1 2022, Detailed design: Q2 - Q3 2022, Procurement: Q4 2022 – Q1 2023, Delivery and fit-out: Q2 2023 – Q2 2024” (p.66) • “Outputs: * Commercial floorspace: 2,050 sqm, * Town Centre uses: 150 sqm, * Workspace: 150 sqm, * Other: 1,750 sqm” (p.67) • “Construction phase outputs: Person years employment: 47, Gross value added: £1.4m, Apprenticeships supported: 4” (p.67) • “Operational phase: Gross employment: 32 FTE, Gross value added: £1.4m” (p.67) • “Fiscal impact: Business rates: £82,000/pa” (p.67) |
| 6. Scope of Work | <p>The Skills and Enterprise Hub will provide digital skills training for key employers and SMEs; and provide individual learners with skills and employability support to assist them into the labour market and continued progression thereafter. The proposed hub will also provide workspace for potential new enterprises, as it has been identified that there is a lack of suitable space (up to 300sqft) for new start-ups.</p> <p>Digital skills are growing in importance across the economy and society as a whole. Basic digital skills are needed to participate fully in society as more services move online, whilst general digital skills are required in almost all jobs. Those working in the increasing number of digital roles (across all sectors of the economy) also need specialist digital skills.</p> <p>The trend towards digital skills being required to access products and services has been accelerated by the Covid-19 pandemic. However, a significant proportion of the population lack basic digital skills. Labour market research undertaken for DCMS has also analysed the digital skills sought by UK employers and the specific requirements for different occupations and sectors. This research categorised digital skills for the workplace as either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘baseline’ or ‘basic’ digital skills – for example using productivity software (Microsoft Word and Excel), computer literacy, handling digital information and content and understanding how technologies work; or • ‘specific’ or ‘advanced’ digital skills – for example software engineering and development, data analytics, IT support and system maintenance, digital marketing and sales, digital design, CRM and machining and manufacturing technology. <p>Consultations within the Working Group and subsequent discussions with a small group of local employers have confirmed the importance and need for digital skills within the local area, alongside employability support for new entrants. To ensure that the Skills Hub is responsive to the needs of the wider SME base within Clay Cross, a skills audit is currently underway.</p> <p>In addition to the demand for skills, the other themes for consideration in developing the business case include the need to agree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geography of businesses accessing the hub – at this stage there is an assumption that the Skills and Enterprise Hub will be for Clay Cross or NEDDC businesses and businesses in wider North Derbyshire. In terms of the boundaries for residents accessing the Hub – the assumption is to target Clay Cross residents in the first instance but this may be broadened out as the project develops. • Operational model – at the Town Investment Plan stage, it was envisaged that the facility would provide flexible skills training facilities, which could be used by a |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

range of partners as a focus for programme delivery. The sustainability of this model needs to be tested.

- Wider services – outline proposals envisaged the co-location of the skills offer with wider public sector services, for example the provision of library services and workspace for new enterprises. Incorporating these activities within the model will be developed through the options analysis.
- Match-funding – proposals within the Town Investment Plan indicated that in the order of £1.7 million of additional funding would be secured. There is a need to scope funding options at an early stage to establish potential budget thresholds for the facility.

The business case will be prepared based on available project designs and supporting information developed to RIBA Stage 2, alongside a business plan for the operation of the facility. This is equivalent to the Outline Business Case stage as set out within HMT guidance.¹

| Section | Description | Evidence/source |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Strategic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change • Project stakeholders and details of consultation undertaken • Policy alignment • Proposed investment and Theory of change • Risks and dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Investment Plan • Skills audit and baseline • Assessment of need – library and public services • Market Assessment for workspace • Risk register |
| Economic case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping • Economic benefit assessment • Economic costs • Value for money • Sensitivity analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option scoping and appraisal framework • Service plan detailing skills and other outcomes • Cost Benefit Analysis technical note (AMION) |
| Financial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project costs • Funding and revenue • Affordability analysis • Financial risks and implications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project cost plan • Business plan (including financial appraisals) • Match-funding commitments • Land valuations |
| Commercial case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status and approvals • Procurement strategy • Commercial delivery plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project delivery plan • Market demand assessment |
| Management case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project governance • Assurance and compliance • Programme management • Risk management • Stakeholder engagement • Monitoring and evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project organogram • Subsidy control – legal opinion • Programme/Gantt Chart • Risk register • Communications plan • Monitoring and evaluation plan |
| Other supporting material | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business plan (NEDDC/DCC) • Project designs (RIBA2) • Site investigation report (desktop) • Building surveys • Planning statement and evidence of pre-app • Letters of support |

¹ [Guide to developing the Project Business Case \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| 7. Working assumptions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Site – no decisions have been made but the TIP hypotheses suggested refurbishment/reconfiguration/extension of the existing Clay Cross Adult Education Centre for the hub, and this remains the working assumption at this stage. No provision was made for the purchase of the facility, as it was assumed that DCC will be an integral partner in the delivery of the scheme; • Delivery mechanism – it is assumed that North East Derbyshire District Council will oversee the phased programme of refurbishment works, following contractor procurement. • Potential Delivery partners – the TIP assumed that the project would create a hub for employers; potential new enterprises; and learners and provide a focus on low carbon and digital skills (for a range of levels including T level skills). This was based on engagement of key employers (Worcester Bosch; CCG) and skills and training providers (Chesterfield College; DCC). There was also an aspiration to relocate the existing library within the new Skills and Enterprise Hub. These assumptions remain and have been tested further through additional discussions with local schools; additional employers (CBE Plus and Microfern); and the library service. A survey of all businesses is currently underway to ensure that the skills provision is demand led. • Deliverables – the refurbishment/reconfiguration/extension of the Clay Cross of Adult Education Centre is the key deliverable from the project. A high-level business plan/operational framework will also be developed for the Hub (proportional to the business case requirements). • Costs – the overall financial contribution of the Clay Cross Town Deal to this project is assumed to be £2.0m (as outlined in the TIP). Match funding of £1.7m is to be provided. This funding is to cover the building works required to refurbish and extend the existing Adult Education Centre. No operational costs have been included in the TIP. • Overall viability – the TIP highlighted the need for a viable business plan for the venture, working with partners to establish an operational framework that provides a foundation for financial sustainability. | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|----------|---|----------|-----------------------|-------|--|-----|
| 8. Dependencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that Derbyshire County Council, which owns the Adult Education Centre, is willing to contribute the premises to the project at nil purchase cost and work in partnership to create the Skills Hub. • Identification of external funding both capital and revenue to support the project. • Confirmation that Chesterfield College (and/or potentially other training providers) will deliver skills training on an outreach basis, alongside existing provision by DCC. • Approval processes for example NEDDC Cabinet approvals and approvals from DCC and external partners including the approval of match funding. • Clay Cross Connections and the potential to relocate the bus station as well as connections to/from a new rail station: connections and easy access to the Skills & Enterprise Hub | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Outputs | <p>The outputs and outcomes identified within the TIP are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="440 1816 1511 1993"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="440 1816 1342 1854">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="1342 1816 1511 1854">Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="440 1854 1342 1899">Delivery of new education and enterprise facilities</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1854 1511 1899">1,200 m2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="440 1899 1342 1944">New learners assisted</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1899 1511 1944">2,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="440 1944 1342 1993">Working age population with qualifications</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1944 1511 1993">50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Indicator | Quantity | Delivery of new education and enterprise facilities | 1,200 m2 | New learners assisted | 2,000 | Working age population with qualifications | 50% |
| Indicator | Quantity | | | | | | | | |
| Delivery of new education and enterprise facilities | 1,200 m2 | | | | | | | | |
| New learners assisted | 2,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Working age population with qualifications | 50% | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | Enterprises utilising high quality affordable and sustainable commercial spaces | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------------|--|----------|--------------------|--------|----------------|---------------|--|-------|---------------|------------------|--|--|-----|-----|--|--|
| 10. Costs | <p>Following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the ‘in principle’ funding award, MHCLG now requires additional mandatory outputs to be collected/ reported annually. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners) • Co-funding committed (private and public) • Co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public) • Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects <i>Target of 30no. FTE</i> • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects • Amount of capacity of new or improved training or education facilities <i>Target of 1,200 sqm</i> <p>Further detail regarding the outputs and outcomes will be provided in a subsequent iteration of this document.</p> <p>Costs:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="440 949 1509 1081"> <thead> <tr> <th>(£million)</th> <th>2020/21</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th>2022/23</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Towns Fund</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Match/co-funding</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case costs: Early release of some Town Deal funding has been approved by MHCLG to aid development and help to bring forward projects. The only additional costs that may be necessary relate to detailed operational business planning. Development of a high-level operational plan only has been assumed at this stage. • Match costs: the TIP suggested that up to £1.7million match funding may be possible for this project, through in-kind contributions, asset value and the proceeds from land sales (e.g. the library). However, there is currently a covenant on the library site, and further exploration of potential funding sources needs to be undertaken. • Town Fund contribution: the financial profile will be reviewed and re-evaluated in light of scoping and site appraisal, and the development of options. The options and associated outputs and outcomes will be presented to the Working Group as part of its Check & Challenge support. This will also consider affordability (within identified budget thresholds) and expected value for money based on the expected economic benefits. | | (£million) | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | Towns Fund | | | 1.5 | 0.5 | | | Match/co-funding | | | 1.2 | 0.5 | | |
| (£million) | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Towns Fund | | | 1.5 | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Match/co-funding | | | 1.2 | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Team Roles | <p>Business Case team:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="440 1704 1430 2000"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Lead</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AMION:</td> <td>Maria Salcedo/Pete Alford</td> <td>Coordinate business case and business planning</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Buttress</td> <td>Martin Kirkpatrick</td> <td>Design</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thomas Lister:</td> <td>Rachel Lister</td> <td>Workspace Demand Assessment/ Land assembly and disposal?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edge:</td> <td>Geoff Tinsley</td> <td>Cost assessment</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Partner | Lead | Role | AMION: | Maria Salcedo/Pete Alford | Coordinate business case and business planning | Buttress | Martin Kirkpatrick | Design | Thomas Lister: | Rachel Lister | Workspace Demand Assessment/ Land assembly and disposal? | Edge: | Geoff Tinsley | Cost assessment | | | | | | |
| Partner | Lead | Role | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMION: | Maria Salcedo/Pete Alford | Coordinate business case and business planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Buttress | Martin Kirkpatrick | Design | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Thomas Lister: | Rachel Lister | Workspace Demand Assessment/ Land assembly and disposal? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Edge: | Geoff Tinsley | Cost assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | | |
|--------|------------|--|
| Nexus: | Pete Toher | Planning and Stakeholder engagement / coordination |
|--------|------------|--|

The wider Working Group who will steer the project between reports to the Town Board comprise the following:

| Partner | Lead | Role |
|--|---|--|
| NEDDC: | Jane Weston Karl Apps | Coordinate NEDDC inputs and lead engagement with delivery partners |
| | Maria Curran | PMO |
| DCC Adult Education | Andy Williams | Provider of skills training |
| Chesterfield College/University of Derby | G.Varley Dr Peter Dewhurst | Potential provider of skills training |
| DWP | Julian Sutton | Potential provider of employability support |
| CCG | | Office space/use of the skills hub for training |
| Private Sector representatives | Worcester Bosch CBE Plus Microfern | Use of the skills hub for training |
| Others | Councillors Cupit, Dale, Renwick and Rouse Tupton Hall School | |

The overall owner of this project, from a Working Group perspective, is Jane Weston as the appointed officer to lead the project from the Council.

12. Workplan


The current working assumptions around the timeline for the business case are as follows:

| Task | Date | Lead/Role/Responsibility |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Desk based SWOT review of Creative Hub and Skills Hub to evaluate opportunities for co-location | July/Aug2021 | AMION/TL |
| Stakeholder engagement (to inform demand/provision) | July - Aug 2021 | NEDDC |
| Baseline/Site Investigations (desktop report) | August 2021 | Buttress/Ramboll |
| Workspace/library/ needs and demand | Aug 21 | NEDDC/AMION/Thomas Lister |
| Land ownership/assembly – baseline analysis | Aug 2021 | Thomas Lister |
| Funding plan – scope potential match-funding options and establish funder objectives | September 2021 | AMION |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | Business Plan – Scope (strategic case) | Sept 2021 | AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----------------|--|--------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|----------------------------|------|--|------|--|--|------|--|------|
| | Design brief and options scoping | Oct 2021 | NEDDC/AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Skills needs – audit | Sept/Oct 2021 | NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Project plans - RIBA 2 concept informed by results from Skills Needs audit | Oct 2021 | Buttress | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Draft Strategic Case | Oct 2021 | AMION/NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cost plan | Oct – Nov 2021 | Edge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Draft Economic Case | Oct – Nov 2021 | AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Financial appraisal | Nov 2021 | NEDDC/AMION/DCC/TL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Outline procurement strategy and delivery plan | Nov 2021 | NEDDC/AMION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Business Plan | Nov 2021 | NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Draft Business Case | Nov-Dec 2021 | Commercial Case – AMION/TL Financial Case – AMION/NEDDC/Edge/Partners Management Case (inc risk register and M&E plan) - AMION/NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Present draft Business Case to WG Check & Challenge | Dec 21 | Present Draft Business Case for agreement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Final Business Case | Dec 2021 | AMION/NEDDC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Business Case Assurance | Jan 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Board Approval | TBC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>The overall timeline for the project remains for now, those outlined in the TIP, pending further analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case: Dec 2021 • Procurement: Q4 2022 – Q1 2023 • Delivery and fit out : Q2 2023- Q2 2024 <p>Significant further work is required to validate these dates in the coming phase.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Risk | <p>Key risks:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Risk name</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Rating</th> <th>Mitigations</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Financial</td> <td>Match funding availability</td> <td>High</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping of potential opportunities for match funding to be carried out at an early stage to inform scope of works. </td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Operational costs/income fail to achieve projections</td> <td>High</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement and consultation with end users/skills delivery partners planned, particularly in relation to paying for training. • Business plan to be prepared which will include marketing/promotion of enterprise space. • Consultations with other businesses in the area required, but demand for employment </td> <td>Open</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status | Financial | Match funding availability | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping of potential opportunities for match funding to be carried out at an early stage to inform scope of works. | Open | | Operational costs/income fail to achieve projections | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement and consultation with end users/skills delivery partners planned, particularly in relation to paying for training. • Business plan to be prepared which will include marketing/promotion of enterprise space. • Consultations with other businesses in the area required, but demand for employment | Open |
| Risk name | Description | Rating | Mitigations | Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial | Match funding availability | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping of potential opportunities for match funding to be carried out at an early stage to inform scope of works. | Open | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Operational costs/income fail to achieve projections | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement and consultation with end users/skills delivery partners planned, particularly in relation to paying for training. • Business plan to be prepared which will include marketing/promotion of enterprise space. • Consultations with other businesses in the area required, but demand for employment | Open | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--------|---|------|
| | | | | and skills support has increased in recent months. | |
| | Programme | Market engagement - risk of limited interest from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • training providers; • employers - while pandemic may have increased the importance of skills, employment and enterprise support, businesses still focussed on re-opening • residents not engaging and participating with training | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up initial engagement with interested parties (Chesterfield College; University; AEC; Worcester Bosch; CCG; other local employers) to establish interest and develop proposals. • Demand for upskilling, reskilling, digital skills increasing. • Explore employability charter to increase digital skills to enhance employment chances and demonstrate the benefits of participation | Open |
| | Business | Failure to meet objectives under the TIP | Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure SMART objectives established and linked to benefits realisation plan. • Ensure targets are informed by skills needs assessment/intelligence | Open |
| 14. Communication and consultation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication assumption: A high-level review has been undertaken of the project and it has been agreed that no immediate communications is necessary beyond the overall work being done for the project as a whole. It is expected that detailed communications will be needed prior to the submission of a business case. Further details will be provided at a subsequent iteration of this document. As will be the approach for all projects, there is a clear desire to consistently and regularly communicate the overall situation on the CXTD on a regular basis to residents – and this project will be expected to contribute this where required. • Consultation assumption: a skills audit/survey is currently being carried out with businesses across Clay Cross as part of a bigger skills audit being undertaken for the district. This will ensure that the skills training provided in the hub responds to the needs of employers. Further consultation with Young People will also be carried out through the Youth Board. | | | | |
| 15. Assumed BAU status | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reconfiguration/extension of the AEC will not take place in the absence of the Town Deal Funding. • The opportunity to deliver much needed digital skills training to improve the employability of young people and upskill people in the workforce will be lost. | | | | |
| 16. Business Case Deliverable |  Clay Cross Business Case Template.docx | | | | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Version_1.0 | PMO |
| Clay Cross D: Skills & Enterprise Hub | 17/09/21 |

Agenda Item 11

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 12

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 13

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 14

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted