

Independent Technical
Evaluator – Growth Deal
Business Case Assessment
(Q4 2017/18)

Accountability Board Report
February 2018

South East Local Enterprise
Partnership

Our ref: 22790506



Independent Technical
Evaluator – Growth Deal
Business Case Assessment
(Q4 2017/18)

Accountability Board Report
February 2018

South East Local
Enterprise Partnership

Our ref: 22790506
Client ref:

Prepared by:
Edmund Cassidy
Steer Davies Gleave
28-32 Upper Ground
London SE1 9PD

+44 20 7910 5000
www.steerdaviesgleave.com

Prepared for:
Adam Bryan
South East Local Enterprise Partnership
Secretariat
c/o Essex County Council
County Hall
Market Road
Chelmsford
Essex
CM1 1QH

Steer Davies Gleave has prepared this work for South East Local Enterprise Partnership. This work may only be used within the context and scope of work for which Steer Davies Gleave was commissioned and may not be relied upon in part or whole by any third party or be used for any other purpose. Any person choosing to use any part of this work without the express and written permission of Steer Davies Gleave shall be deemed to confirm their agreement to indemnify Steer Davies Gleave for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Steer Davies Gleave has prepared this work using professional practices and procedures using information available to it at the time and as such any new information could alter the validity of the results and conclusions made.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Independent Technical Evaluation of Q4 2017/18 starting Growth Deal Schemes..... | 1 |
| | Overview | 1 |
| | Method | 1 |
| | Evaluation Results..... | 3 |
| | Summary Findings and Considerations for the Board | 3 |
| 2 | Independent Technical Evaluation of Q4 2017/18 Local Growth Fund Allocation Change Requests | 8 |
| | Overview | 8 |
| | Queensway Gateway Road..... | 8 |
| | North Bexhill Access Road | 9 |
| | Eastbourne town centre access & improvement package | 9 |
| 3 | Independent Technical Evaluation of Q4 2017/18 Growing Places Fund Schemes | 10 |
| | Overview | 10 |
| | Evaluation Results..... | 10 |

1 Independent Technical Evaluation of Q4 2017/18 starting Growth Deal Schemes

Overview

- 1.1 Steer Davies Gleave were reappointed by the South East Local Enterprise Partnership in April 2016 as Independent Technical Evaluators. It is a requirement of Central Government that every Local Enterprise Partnership subjects its business cases and decisions on investment to independent scrutiny.
- 1.2 This report is for the review of final Business Cases for schemes which are seeking funding through Local Growth Fund Rounds 1 to 3. Recommendations are made for funding approval on 23rd February 2018 by the Accountability Board, in line with the South East Local Enterprise Partnership's own governance.

Method

- 1.3 The review provides commentary on the Business Cases submitted by scheme promoters, and feedback on the strength of business case, the Value for Money likely to be delivered by the scheme (as set out in the business case) and the certainty of securing that Value for Money.
- 1.4 Our role as Independent Technical Evaluator is not to purely assess adherence to guidance, nor to make a 'go' / 'no go' decisions on funding, but to provide evidence to the South East Local Enterprise Partnership Board to make such decisions based on expert, independent and transparent advice. Approval will, in part, depend on the appetite of the Board to approve funding for schemes where Value for Money is not assessed as being high (i.e. where a benefit to cost ratio is below two to one and / or where information and / or analysis is incomplete).
- 1.5 The assessment is based on adherence of scheme business cases to Her Majesty's Treasury's *The Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government*, and related departmental guidance such as the Department for Transport's WebTAG (Web-based Transport Analysis Guidance) or the MHCLG Appraisal Guide¹. All of these provide proportionate methodologies for scheme appraisal (i.e. business case development).
- 1.6 Pro forma have been developed based on the criteria of *The Green Book*, a 'checklist for appraisal assessment from Her Majesty's Treasury, and WebTAG. Assessment criteria were removed or substituted if not relevant for a non-transport scheme.
- 1.7 Individual criteria were assessed and the given a 'RAG' (Red – Amber – Green) rating, with a summary rating for each case. The consistent and common understanding of the ratings are as follows:
- **Green:** approach or assumption(s) in line with guidance and practice or the impact of any departures is sufficiently insignificant to the Value for Money category assessment.
 - **Amber:** approach or assumption(s) out of line with guidance and practice, with limited significance to the Value for Money category assessment, but should be amended in future submissions (e.g. at Final Approval stage).
 - **Red:** approach or assumption(s) out of line with guidance and practice, with material or unknown significance to the Value for Money category assessment, requires amendment or further evidence in support before Gateway can be passed.

¹ Source: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/220541/green_book_complete.pdf

1.8 The five cases of a government business case are:

- **Strategic Case:** demonstration of strategic fit to national, Local Enterprise Partnership and local policy, predicated upon a robust and evidence-based case for change, with a clear definition of outcomes and objectives.
- **Economic Case:** demonstration that the scheme optimises public value to the UK as a whole, through a consideration of options, subject to cost-benefit analysis quantifying in monetary terms as many of the costs and benefits as possible of short-listed options against a counterfactual, and a preferred option subject to sensitivity testing and consideration of risk analysis, including optimism bias.
- **Commercial Case:** demonstration of how the preferred option will result in a viable procurement and well-structured deal, including contractual terms and risk transfer.
- **Financial Case:** demonstration of how the preferred option will be fundable and affordable in both capital and revenue terms, and how the deal will impact on the balance sheet, income and expenditure account, and pricing of the public sector organisation. Any requirement for external funding, including from a local authority, must be supported by clear evidence of support for the scheme together with any funding gaps.
- **Management Case:** demonstration that the preferred option is capable of being delivered successfully in accordance with recognised best practice, and contains strong project and programme management methodologies.

1.9 In addition to a rating for each of the five cases, comments have been provided against Central Government guidance on assurance – **reasonableness** of the analysis, risk of error (or **robustness** of the analysis), and **uncertainty**. Proportionality is applied across all three areas.

1.10 Assessments were conducted by a team of transport and economic planning professionals, and feedback and support has been given to scheme promoters throughout the process through workshops, meetings, telephone calls and emails between November 2017 and January 2018.

Evaluation Results

- 1.11 Table 1.1 below provides the results of our independent technical evaluation of each scheme seeking funding approval on 23rd February 2018 by the South East Local Enterprise Partnership Accountability Board. It includes both our interim assessment ('Gate 1 Assessment') of each Outline Business Case and the subsequent final assessment of revised business cases updated in light of our initial feedback ('Gate 2 Assessment'). More detailed feedback has been issued to each scheme promoter and the secretariat of the South East Local Enterprise Partnership using a standard transport and non-transport assessment pro forma.

Summary Findings and Considerations for the Board

- 1.12 The following list contains recommendations to the Accountability Board, including key findings from the evaluation process and any issues arising.

Recommendations

- 1.13 The following schemes achieve high Value for Money with high certainty of achieving this:
- **A289 Four Elms (£11.1m):** The aim of the scheme is to provide a highway network between junction 1 of the M2 and the Medway Tunnel which can accommodate the likely housing growth on the Hoo Peninsula that has been identified in the emerging Local Plan. The business case analysis provides a proportionate assessment of the scheme costs and benefits which resulted in a strong benefit cost ratio representing very high Value for Money (VfM). The analysis was robustly carried out and delivers high levels of certainty around this VfM categorisation. This scheme was originally approved in 2015 at which point it had a BCR of 4.1:1. Due to a recent WebTAG change to the business user value of time, the monetised journey time benefit of business users brought about by this scheme has increased considerably. This accounts for the majority of the increase in the benefits of the scheme and consequently the increase in BCR.
 - **Gilden Way Upgrading (£5.0m):** The scheme consists of widening and improvements to 1.8km of the existing Gilden Road, to provide access for the new housing development at Harlowbury and to provide a link to the proposed new Junction 7a on the M11. The business case analysis provides a proportionate assessment of the scheme costs and benefits which results in a strong benefit cost ratio representing high VfM. The analysis was robustly carried out and delivers high levels of certainty around this VfM categorisation.
 - **Bexhill and Hastings Movement and Access Package (£9.0m):** This is Phase 1 of an integrated package of cycling, walking and bus infrastructure, traffic management and public realm improvements, aimed at supporting economic growth across Bexhill and Hastings. A thorough and proportionate approach has been taken to assessing the costs and benefits of the package and this has shown that the scheme represents very high VfM with a high level of certainty.
- 1.14 The following scheme achieves high Value for Money with medium/high certainty of achieving this:
- **Chelmsford Growth Package (£10.0m):** This will deliver a package of schemes to provide additional transportation capacity through enhanced sustainable transport, highways capacity improvements and key safety and technology upgrades for the City of Chelmsford. A thorough and proportionate approach has been taken to assessing the costs and benefits of the component schemes which make up the wider package. The wider package represents very high VfM, however there are individual schemes within the package which represent low VfM. The strategic case articulates the dependence of the integrity of the package on the delivery of the low VfM schemes. Nonetheless, we invite the Accountability Board to consider this before determining whether or not to approve funding for the scheme.

1.15 The following scheme achieves high Value for Money with medium certainty of achieving this:

- **Southend Forum 2 (£6.0m):** The scheme will deliver a 5,308 sqm new building on Council owned land immediately opposite the existing Forum scheme within the Southend Learning Quarter. It will support this key regeneration area as an educational and cultural quarter. The business case analysis has been carried out in a robust and reasonable manner with the economic case demonstrating that the scheme will provide high VfM. While there is nothing to suggest that the balance of risk points in either direction, we note that the BCR for the scheme is 2.2:1, and therefore the VfM categorisation will be very sensitive to any net downside risks. As a consequence, we invite the Accountability Board to consider this risk before determining whether or not to approve funding for the scheme.

1.16 The South East Local Enterprise Partnership Assurance Framework states that schemes may be eligible for exemption from quantified benefit cost analysis when the cost of the project is below £2.0m and there is an overwhelming strategic case (with minimal risk in the other cases). The following schemes are subject to this exemption and it is estimated that they will achieve high VfM. However, without quantified benefit cost analysis we cannot guarantee this outturn VfM categorisation. Therefore our recommendation is that there is a low/medium certainty of achieving high VfM:

- **Kent Sustainable Interventions Programme (£0.5m):** This programme involves the delivery of smaller schemes designed to complement and maximise the benefits of larger schemes. Due to small-scale nature of the proposed interventions, a quantified assessment methodology has not been used. A qualitative approach in-line with the DfT Appraisal Summary Table has been followed and, based on other schemes and experience, it is estimated that the combination of schemes would represent high VfM.

We are satisfied that an overwhelming strategic case has been made for this scheme and that there is minimal risk in the other cases. However, we invite the Accountability Board to consider the risk that a lack of quantified benefit cost analysis presents before determining whether or not to approve funding for the scheme.

- **Kent Strategic Congestion Management Programme (£1.0m):** The programme involves improvements to maximise the efficiency of the local highway network as traffic levels increase in line with development. Due to small-scale nature of proposed interventions, a quantified assessment methodology has not been used. To provide an indication of the VfM, a benchmarking exercise was carried out. Based on other schemes and experience, it is estimated that the combination of schemes would represent high VfM.

We are satisfied an overwhelming strategic case has been made for this scheme and that there is minimal risk in the other cases. However, we invite the accountability Board to consider the risk that a lack of quantified benefit cost analysis presents before determining whether or not to approve funding for the scheme.

Table 1.1: Gate 1 & 2 Assessment of Growth Deal Schemes seeking Approval for Funding for Q4 2017/18

| Scheme Name | Local Growth Fund Allocation (£m) | Benefit to Cost Ratio ('x' to 1) | Strategic Case Summary | Economic Case Summary | Commercial Case Summary | Financial Case Summary | Management Case Summary | Assurance of Value for Money | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Reasonableness of Analysis | Robustness of Analysis | Uncertainty |
| A289 Four Elms | 11.1 | Gate 1: 9.9 | Amber/ Green | Amber | Amber | Amber/ Green | Green | A reasonable and proportionate methodology has been employed. | There are some clarifications required around the assumptions underpinning the appraisal. | Provision of TUBA outputs would provide greater certainty of the benefits split by journey purpose. |
| | | Gate 2: 10.2 | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | As above | Clarification has been provided of the appraisal assumptions. This now represents a robust analytical exercise. | TUBA outputs have helped in the sense checking of the benefit cost ratio. |
| Gilden Way Upgrading | 5.0 | Gate 1: 3.0 | Green | Amber/ Green | Green | Amber/ Green | Green | A sensible and proportionate methodology has been carried out. | The analysis is robust with a clear and compliant appraisal using up to date assumptions | The analysis has helped reduce uncertainty. The business case is complete with few amendments required. |
| | | Gate 2: 3.0 | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | As above | As above | As above |
| Bexhill and Hastings Movement and Access Package | 9.0 | Gate 1: 2.3 | Amber | Red/ Amber | Amber | Amber | Amber/ Green | A more comprehensive option assessment should be carried out to demonstrate the case for the preferred option. | Further information is required to justify the assumptions employed in the economic appraisal. | Quantified risk assessment has not been carried out. This reduces the certainty of the Value for Money of the scheme. |
| | | Gate 2: | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Additional option | Clarification has been | A comprehensive QRA |

| Scheme Name | Local Growth Fund | Benefit to Cost Ratio (VfM) | Strategic Case Summary | Economic Case Summary | Commercial Case Summary | Financial Case Summary | Management Case Summary | Assurance of Value for Money | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| Chelmsford Growth Package | | 2.8 | | | | | | assessment has been provided. | provided of the assumptions underpinning the appraisal. This now represents robust business case analysis. | exercise has been carried out which provides greater certainty around the validity of the 26% risk uplift applied to the costs. This increases the certainty of the Value for Money of the scheme. |
| | 10.0 | Gate 1: 6.0 | Amber | Amber | Amber/ Green | Amber/ Green | Amber/ Green | A more comprehensive option assessment should be carried out to demonstrate the case for the preferred option. | Further clarification and breakdown in calculations and assumptions is required to increase confidence in the analysis. | Sensitivity testing has not been carried out which reduces certainty around the resilience of the Value for Money, |
| | | Gate 2: 5.6 | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Additional option assessment has been provided. | Additional information has been provided to increase certainty around Value for Money. | Sensitivity testing has been carried out. The business case now provides sufficient certainty around the Value for Money of the scheme. |
| | 6.0 | Gate 1: 2.18 | Amber/ Green | Amber/ Green | Green | Amber/ Green | Amber/ Green | More detail is required to justify use of HCA and SFA guided appraisal rather than MHCLG. | Analysis has been carried out in a robust manner. Some small clarifications around appraisal assumptions are required. | Sensitivity testing has not been carried out which reduces certainty around the resilience of the Value for Money, |
| Southend Forum 2 | | Gate 2: 2.18 | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Additional details have been provided to make the case for the preferred appraisal approach. This constitutes a reasonable and proportionate methodology. | Clarity has been provided around appraisal assumptions. | Sensitivity testing has been carried out. The business case now provides sufficient certainty around the Value for Money of the scheme. |

| Scheme Name | Local Growth Fund | Benefit to Cost Ratio (%) | Strategic Case Summary | Economic Case Summary | Commercial Case Summary | Financial Case Summary | Management Case Summary | Assurance of Value for Money | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| Kent Sustainable Interventions Programme | 0.5 | Gate 1: Not Derived | Amber/ Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | A sensible and proportionate methodology has been applied. The scheme is subject to an exemption from quantitative economic appraisal. | A qualitative approach to economic appraisal has been employed which is typically less robust than a quantitative approach. | A quantitative approach results in less certainty around the Value for Money of the scheme. |
| | | Gate 2: Not Derived | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | As above | As above | As above |
| Kent Strategic Congestion Management Programme | 1.0 | Gate 1: Not Derived | Amber/ Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | A sensible and proportionate methodology has been applied. The scheme is subject to an exemption from quantitative economic appraisal. | A qualitative approach to economic appraisal has been employed which is typically less robust than a quantitative approach. | A quantitative approach results in less certainty around the Value for Money of the scheme. |
| | | Gate 2: Not Derived | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | As above | As above | As above |

2 Independent Technical Evaluation of Q4 2017/18 Local Growth Fund Allocation Change Requests

Overview

- 2.1 The SELEP Assurance Framework states that any variations to a project's costs, scope, outcomes or outputs from the information specified in the Business Case must be reported to the Accountability Board. When the changes are expected to have a substantial impact on forecast project benefits, outputs and outcomes as agreed in the business case which may detrimentally impact on the Value for Money assessment, it is expected that the business case should be re-evaluated by the ITE.
- 2.2 In light of the increased costs on the projects below, Steer Davies Gleave have carried out a reassessment of their Value for Money categorisation, comparing the Value for Money upon which the original recommendation to the Accountability Board was made and the current Value for Money of the scheme.

Queensway Gateway Road

- 2.3 East Sussex County Council has submitted a change request to increase in LGF allocation for the Queensway Gateway Road scheme. The change request is for an increase in LGF allocation of £4m. Of this £1m will be transferred from the A22/A27 Junction Improvement scheme and £3m from the Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package.
- 2.4 The £1m diverted from the A22/A27 Junction Improvement scheme is available because when that scheme was originally identified Highways England were exploring a series of interventions along this corridor and additional funding was offered up through LGF to ensure these schemes could go ahead. Highways England have now made their investment announcements for this route and no longer require the additional money but will still be delivering the previously identified interventions for which this money was allocated. £3m of the £4m is no longer required for investment in this area. As such the funding is being reallocated to other schemes facing additional costs, but which aim to deliver similar benefits to A22/A27 Junction Improvement scheme.
- 2.5 The £3m diverted from the Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package has come about due to a reduction in funding requirement for that scheme. This has come about principally through a comprehensive quantified risk assessment which has de risked the project and hence reduce the required cost uplift. This reallocation has, therefore, not had a negative impact on the Value for Money of the Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package.
- 2.6 The original business case, as reviewed by Steer Davies Gleave in March 2015, was based on a scheme cost of £15m, with a BCR of 2.7:1. This represented high Value for Money, with a medium/high level of certainty of that Value for Money. Subsequent design changes and the availability of large quantities of earth being made available from other nearby projects meant that the budget was then reduced to £6m.
- 2.7 An additional £6m is required for completion of the scheme (£4m for LGF and an additional £2m from developer contributions). Therefore the revised cost of the scheme is £12m. This is still significantly below the scheme cost which was originally approved. The benefits of this project have not changed and as a result the revised BCR is 3.4:1.
- 2.8 Given the fact that the scheme is in its delivery phase, uncertainty about the delivery and benefits realisation can be reduced. Therefore, this scheme, with the increase costs considered, represents high Value for Money with high certainty of achieving that Value for Money.

North Bexhill Access Road

- 2.9 East Sussex County Council has submitted a change request to increase the LGF allocation for the North Bexhill Access Road scheme. It is anticipated that the increase in LGF allocation will be £2m. This £2m will be transferred from the A22/A27 Junction Improvement scheme.
- 2.10 The £2m diverted from the A22/A27 Junction Improvement scheme is available because when that scheme was originally identified Highways England were exploring a series of interventions along this corridor and additional funding was offered up through LGF to ensure these schemes could go ahead. Highways England have now made their investment announcements for this route and no longer require the additional money but will still be delivering the previously identified interventions for which this money was allocated. £3m of the £4m is no longer required for investment in this area. As such the funding is being reallocated to other schemes facing additional costs, but which aim to deliver similar benefits to A22/A27 Junction Improvement scheme.
- 2.11 The original business case, as reviewed by Steer Davies Gleave in November 2015, was based on a scheme cost of £16.6m, with a BCR of 2.4:1. This represented high Value for Money, with a medium/high level of certainty of that Value for Money.
- 2.12 An additional £2m is required for completion of the scheme. Therefore, the revised cost of the scheme is £18.6m. The benefits of this project have not changed and as a result the revised BCR is 2.1:1.
- 2.13 Given the fact that the scheme is in its delivery phase, uncertainty about the delivery and benefits realisation can be reduced. Therefore, this scheme, with the increased costs considered, represents high Value for Money with high certainty of achieving that Value for Money.

Eastbourne Town Centre Access and Improvement Package

- 2.14 East Sussex County Council has submitted a change request to increase the LGF allocation for the Eastbourne Town Centre Access and Improvement Package. It is anticipated that the increase in LGF allocation will be £2m. This £2m will be transferred from the Eastbourne and South Wealden Walking and Cycling Package.
- 2.15 The £2m diverted from Eastbourne and South Wealden Walking and Cycling Package is a transfer of provisional funding allocated to the scheme as part of Growth Deal Round 1. This scheme is still at business case development stage. Work is being done to ensure that the same economic benefits which were indicated would be delivered by the scheme during the bidding process, can be delivered at the reduced cost. The revised Value for Money of the Eastbourne and South Wealden Walking and Cycling Package will be assessed when the business case is submitted for independent technical evaluation.
- 2.16 The original business case for Eastbourne Town Centre Access and Improvement Package, as reviewed by Steer Davies Gleave in February 2016, was based on a scheme cost of £6.25m, with a BCR of 4.7:1. This represented high Value for Money, with a medium/high level of certainty of that Value for Money.
- 2.17 An additional £2m is required for completion of the scheme. Therefore, the revised cost of the scheme is £8.25m. The benefits of this project have not changed as a result of this cost increase, but a review of the scheme has meant that large elements of the cycling provision have been removed. This descoping means that the associated benefits will not be delivered. As a result of the cost increase and descoping, the revised BCR is 3.3:1.
- 2.18 Given the fact that the scheme is in its delivery phase, uncertainty about the delivery and benefits realisation can be reduced. Therefore, this scheme, with the increase costs considered, represents high Value for Money with high certainty of achieving that Value for Money

3 Independent Technical Evaluation of Q4 2017/18 Growing Places Fund Schemes

Overview

- 3.1 As part of its Independent Technical Evaluator role Steer Davies Gleave has assessed business cases for schemes seeking a Growing Places Fund loan allocation from SELEP.
- 3.2 SELEP proposed an approach to prioritisation and award of the GPF loan funding. This approach was discussed and agreed upon at the June 2017 Strategic Board.
- 3.3 Schemes being assessed at this stage have already passed through the preliminary qualification phases, namely:
- Phase 1: Sifting of Expressions of Interest (EOI), and
 - Phase 2: Prioritisation of Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC)
- 3.4 The prioritisation of GPF projects was considered and approved, via correspondence, by the SELEP Strategic Board during November 2017. Scheme promoters then developed Outline Business Cases (OBC) for independent technical evaluation and subsequent consideration by the Accountability Board.

Evaluation Results

Summary Findings and Considerations for the Board

- 3.5 The following list contains recommendations to the Accountability Board, including key findings from the evaluation process and any issues arising.

Recommendations

- 3.6 The following schemes achieve high Value for Money with high certainty of achieving this:
- **Colchester Northern Gateway (£2.0m):** The proposed scheme forms part of the overall Colchester Northern Gateway vision which is to create a high quality, highly sustainable housing, employment, and leisure destination at one of the primary gateways to the town centre. With funding for the majority of the scheme secured and strong alignment with local and national strategic priorities the Colchester Northern Gateway proposal has a compelling strategic case. A robust analytical exercise has taken place to assess the costs and benefits of the scheme. This has shown that the scheme will delivers high Value for Money on the loan investment. While £2m risk and contingency has been factored into the cost schedule there remains the deliverability risk that £3.7m of the overall funding package is yet to be secured and relies on successful bids for external funding. This risk is being mitigated through early engagement with the funding bodies. Moreover, repayment is planned in one tranche at the end of the repayment period and relies upon the revenue from land sales from the employment sites developed as a later phase of the wider Northern Gateway project. This presents a risk to the timely repayment and contribution to a revolving fund. We invite the accountability Board to consider the delivery and repayment risks before determining whether or not to approve funding for the scheme.
 - **Charleston Centenary (£0.1m):** The scheme involves the fit out of the former threshing barn space as a destination café-restaurant. This will be a considerable improvement on Charleston's existing catering facilities. The scheme is in line with SELEP's cultural priorities and the schedule and procedure for payback of the loan demonstrates that contribution to a revolving fund is secure. Proportionate and sensible economic appraisal modelling has been carried out. This has demonstrated that the scheme represents high Value for Money.

- **NUE Commercial (£1.0m):** The project aims to return long-term empty, commercial properties to use for residential, alternative commercial or mixed-use purposes. In particular, it will focus on town centres (particularly in coastal areas of Kent), where secondary retail and other commercial areas have been neglected as a result of larger regeneration schemes. There is a clear strategic rationale for the scheme and the schedule and procedure for payback of the loan demonstrates that contribution to a revolving fund is secure. The quantifiable benefits of the scheme support a good economic case for the scheme and the wider impact of bringing back into use long term empty units strengthens the Value for Money case. Proportionate and sensible economic appraisal modelling has been carried out. This has demonstrated that the scheme represents high Value for Money.

Our offices

Bogotá, Colombia

+57 1 322 1470

colombiainfo@sdgworld.net

Bologna, Italy

+39 051 656 9381

italyinfo@sdgworld.net

Boston, USA

+1 (617) 391 2300

usainfo@sdgworld.net

Denver, USA

+1 (303) 416 7226

usainfo@sdgworld.net

Leeds, England

+44 113 389 6400

leedsinfo@sdgworld.net

London, England

+44 20 7910 5000

sdginfo@sdgworld.net

Los Angeles, USA

+1 (213) 337 6790

usainfo@sdgworld.net

Madrid, Spain

+34 91 541 8696

spaininfo@sdgworld.net

Mexico City, Mexico

+52 (55) 5615 0041

mexicoinfo@sdgworld.net

New York, USA

+1 (617) 391 2300

usainfo@sdgworld.net

Rome, Italy

+39 06 4201 6169

italyinfo@sdgworld.net

San Juan, Puerto Rico

+1 (787) 721 2002

puertoricoinfo@sdgworld.net

Santiago, Chile

+56 2 2757 2600

chileinfo@sdgworld.net

São Paulo, Brazil

+55 (11) 3151 3630

brasilinfo@sdgworld.net

Toronto, Canada

+1 (647) 260 4860

canadainfo@sdgworld.net

Vancouver, Canada

+1 (604) 629 2610

canadainfo@sdgworld.net