Brilliant Barrow Board

Friday 22 October 2021, 9:00am – 11:00am

Item	Agenda Item	Time	P/R/V*
1	Opening comments from Chair	9:00	V
2	Apologies for absence	9:05	V
3	Declarations of interest	9:10	V
4	Matters arising not covered in agenda	9:15	V
5	Minutes of last meeting – 23rd Sept, 2021	9:20	R
6	Work Programme and Risk Update	9:25	R
7	Business Case Assurance ***Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as this report contains exempt information relating to financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).***	9:40	R
8	Town Deal Submission	10:20	R
9	Communications Update	10:40	V
10	AOB	10:50	V

* Presentation / Report / Verbal

BRILLIANT BARROW BOARD

Meeting: Thursday, 23rd September, 2021
at 11.30 a.m. (Virtual Meeting)

PRESENT:

Steve Cole – Chair (BAE Systems), Cllr Ann Thomson – Vice Chair (Barrow BC), Sam Plum (Barrow BC), Michael Barry (Cumbria CC), Chris Clouter (ABP), Simon Fell (MP), Janet Garner (BAE Systems), Jill Glennie (Spirit Energy), Ali Greenhalgh (Cumbria CVS) – Minute No's 20 – 25 Only, Paul Hodgson (Barrow BID), Alison Hatcher (Cumbria CC), Jo Lappin (Cumbria LEP) – Minute No's 20 – 25 only, Julie Mennell (University of Cumbria), Alysha Moore (Futures Board), Lauren Newby (Hatch Regeneris), Duncan Nicolson (National Lottery), Alec Proffitt Minute No. 22 only, Judith Wilkinson (DWP) and Liz Watson (Cumbria CC).

Paula Westwood – Minute Taker (BBC).

ITEM	ACTION
14 – Introductions and opening comments from the Chair The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting which had been called as an interim meeting to check in at a critical point in the process of compiling Business Cases. He stated that it was important that all Board Members were comfortable with the progress in appraising the Business Cases as well as to review any emerging issues and obtain an update on risk. **15– Apologies** Apologies for absence had been received from Andrew Atherton (University of Cumbria), Suzanne Caldwell (Cumbria Chamber of Commerce), Steph Cordon (BC), Neil McCullouch (Spirit Energy), Daniel Tyler-McTighe (Barra Culture), Andrew Wren (Furness College). Jill Glennie had attended as a substitute for Neil McCullouch. **16 – Declarations of Interest** The Chair noted that each member of the Board each had interests in matters pertaining to their respective organisations and that it was not necessary for these to be repeated at every meeting as these had been recorded in the register of interests.	

ITEM	ACTION
17 – Matters Arising not covered elsewhere on the Agenda There had been no matters arising, not covered elsewhere on the Agenda. **18 – Minutes of the Last Meeting** The minutes of the meeting held on 16th July, 2021 were agreed as a correct record. **19 – Business Case Assurance Update** Liz Watson, Lead Officer for Economic Programme at Cumbria County Council advised that the assurance process of Town Deal Business Cases were being undertaken in line with the agreed Local Assurance Framework and in accordance with the Five Case Model. The key aim of the assurance process was to ensure that the project was robust, deliverable, aligned to a clear case for intervention and represented good value for money. Supporting the Programme Management Office (PMO) function, independent appraisers were in the process of completing a Green Book appraisal of the Business Cases to provide the required assurance, for review and approval by the Board and the Accountable Body. Liz advised that the Business Cases for all seven schemes had been subject to an initial review and schemes were now at different stages in responding to detailed queries. In all cases, responses had been requested by no later than 24th September. That was to allow for the final review to be undertaken by the appraisers. Following that, an assurance report would be completed which would include a clear recommendation, with summaries of each of the Five Cases and key risks highlighted. Where possible, those risks would be mitigated by the recommendation of conditions to form part of the approval and contracting process. It would also highlight any project specific risks that should be escalated for inclusion on the Programme Risk Register. That report, along with any supporting documentation that may be required, would then be made available to the Board to provide the required assurance for review and approval by the Board and the Accountable Body.	

ITEM	ACTION
The Chair asked if any help was required from the Board. Liz stated that no assistance was required at present, but the timetable must be adhered to. RESOLVED:- To note the progress of the Business Case Assurance Process. **20 – Programme Management Resource and Early Capital Spend Requirement** Michael Barry advised that during late August and early September, revised guidance had been received from Government concerning resource allocation for Programme Management and new requirements had been put in place concerning programme cashflow as follows:- • The requirement for Programme Management resource to be defined with the Town Deal financial profile; and • The requirement for Towns to receive and spend 5% of their total capital allocation within 2021/22 financial year. Michael advised that this presented challenges to the programme, particularly given the advanced stage of development that projects had reached, and the need to maintain progress towards final submission to MHCLG by 17th November. The impacts of these requirements and a recommended approach to address the challenges had been presented as follows:- <u>Programme Management Resource</u> It was essential that appropriate resources were in place to effectively manage ongoing delivery of the Town Investment Plan, until the end of the programme delivery in March 2026. The Town Investment Plan had included an 'ask' of £500,000 to resource Programme Management, however that had not been offered by Government in the subsequent Town Deal Heads of Terms and the full £25m allocation had been directed towards projects within the Town Investment Plan (TIP). Government had now advised that Programme Management must be defined within the final programme financial profile, which was due to be submitted to MHCLG by 27th September.	

ITEM	ACTION
No additional funding had been offered and therefore any Towns Fund used towards Programme Management must come from within the original £25m Heads of Terms settlement. The Accountable Body had identified a requirement of £500,000 over the 4 years of delivery to March 2026. This was consistent with the original TIP 'ask' and represented 2% of the Town Deal. These costs related to management at programme-level and the fulfilment of obligations as Accountable Body, including finance and audit responsibilities. Costs relating to the management of projects delivered directly by the Accountable Body were not included. As was the case with all seven projects in the Town Investment Plan; project management costs formed part of the costs specified within project Business Cases. Expenditure on Programme Management was considered a revenue funded activity. MHCLG limits the use of Towns Fund against revenue activities to 7% of the overall Town Deal, to include both Programme Management and any allocation of revenue to projects. As noted above, currently all revenue funding within the Town Investment Plan was allocated to projects, with no allocation to Programme Management and this equated to 5% of the programme. MHCLG had confirmed that some degree of variance to the original ratio of capital and revenue within the Heads of Terms could be accommodated, however that would be assessed on a case-by-case basis and no guarantee of approval had been provided. On that basis, the recommended approach would be to determine where existing allocations to projects within the Town Investment Plan could be amended, to release the £500,000 Programme Management funding requirement. This approach would allow any necessary amendments to the detail of Projects and Business Cases to be progressed immediately, with the required level of assurance, within the available timeframe leading to submission of Town Deal Summary Documents for the 17th November deadline. Available options for implementing revisions to existing project allocations had been noted as follows:- **A pro-rata reduction based on the level of existing allocations** - Time and resource requirements to undertake Accountable Body activities and Programme Management were expected to be roughly equal across all projects. Any 'pro-rata' reductions linked directly to project allocations would therefore not be equitable and would be difficult to justify.	

ITEM	ACTION
As revenue funding currently accounted for 5.5% of the programme, taking a large proportion of Programme Management resource from capital projects (which would be the case when using a pro-rata approach) would take revenue funding above the 7% limit and MHCLG approval would be required; **An equal reduction across all seven projects** – This would equate to approximately a £71,000 reduction to each project. While this approach was equitable, the impact on each project would be expected to vary. Larger projects may be in a position to accommodate the reduction within risk allowances, whereas projects with smaller allocations and those 100% funded through the Town Deal would need to consider potential impacts on levels of project activity and project outcomes. Under this option, there would be a minor increase above the 7% revenue limit, potentially requiring MHCLG approval; **Approaching projects to 'offer up' a proportion of existing allocations** – When considering this option, again there would be potential to go above the 7% revenue limit, dependent on which projects offered up a proportion of their allocation. However, offers from existing revenue allocations would not alter the existing ratio of capital and revenue funding within the programme. Projects with revenue allocations had therefore been considered first under this option. The Business & Enterprise Support project had the highest existing revenue allocation at £800,000 (just under 60% of the existing revenue total) and was the only project which consisted entirely of revenue activities. The Community Hubs & Earnse Bay project included a revenue allocation of £400,000 which provided a revenue to deliver activity at the Hubs and the Outdoor Centre during early years of operation. The Place Development project included a revenue allocation of £170,000 which provided staffing resource and an activities budget, to oversee delivery of the project and support development of a sustainable programme of events. Of the three projects, the Business & Enterprise Support project was considered the most 'scale-able' in terms of its activities, which would deliver business assists calculated on a unit cost basis. Discussions with the project delivery body had indicated that a reduction in scale would achieve a saving of £300,000 which could be 'offered up' towards Programme Management funding.	

ITEM	ACTION
As noted, the project currently accounted for just under 60% of revenue funding within the Town Investment Plan and the funding offered by CLEP for re-allocation represented 60% of the Programme Management funding requirement. That would provide a pragmatic solution which maintained the project within the TIP while minimising the amendments required across other projects and avoided significant amendment to capital allocations, which was an important consideration given the 7% revenue limit. CLEP were currently working to establish the impact of the proposed reduction on overall project activity levels and project outcomes, which would be reflected in the final Business Case and Town Deal Summary Document to come forward to the Brilliant Barrow Board in October. In terms of securing the remaining £200,000 required to support Programme Management, an equal reduction across the other projects in the Town Investment Plan had been considered as the preferred option. The relatively small reduction required in each case (just over £33,000) would minimise the potential impact of each project and limit the extent of revisions required to Business Cases. Although some reduction would be achieved through reducing capital allocations (moved to revenue under Programme Management) the overall impact would not take revenue allocations above the 7% limit.; or **A mix of some or all of these approaches.** Jo Lappin advised that the LEP remained committed to delivering the Business & Enterprise Support Project and to scale accordingly to deliver the required outcomes. In view of the information presented, it had been recommended that the identified £500,000 requirement for Programme Management resource be met by:- 1. Reducing the allocation to the Business & Enterprise Support project from £800,000 to £500,000; and 2. The remaining £200,000 required for Programme Management should be shared equally, by reducing the allocation to each of the other six projects within the Town Investment Plan (a reduction of £33,333 for each).	

ITEM	ACTION
Early Capital Spend Requirement Michael Barry advised that in August MHCLG had introduced a requirement for Towns to receive and spend 5% of their total capital allocation within 2021/22 financial year. Based on the current level of capital within the Town Investment Plan (notwithstanding any amendments as a result of Programme Management funding requirement), that equated to a 2021/22 payment from MHCLG of £1,181,500.00. Current Business Case profiles indicated a 2021/22 Towns Fund spend of £789,000 which fell well short of the 5% requirement. Guidance released by MHCLG sets out the following key points regarding the 5% early spend requirement: • The 5% advance received for 2021/22 must be spent 'in year'; • Contractual commitment, as well as payments, could count towards meeting the 5%; • 5% would be deducted from all future payments to Local Authorities, to account for the advance; and • Where the 5% advance was used towards projects which ultimately do not proceed, MHCLG would not seek to claw back the funding concerned but nor would it be replaced. It had been noted that work had been undertaken with project leads to determine whether activities originally scheduled in 2022/23 could be accelerated, to provide additional spend in 2021/22. While some development work could be accelerated, reaching the 5% target also relied on elements of delivery being accelerated. That would bring an increased level of risk in terms of whether spend would ultimately be achievable, given the volume of activity that would require acceleration. Project Business Cases would also require amendment to reflect earlier delivery. Michael advised that in subsequent meetings with MHCLG, the following additional clarifications had been provided: • MHCLG accepted that Towns may not have sufficient project spend in 2021/22 to use the full 5% advance – they stressed that payment of the advance was not connected to submitted project spend profiles and Local Authorities should use their 'freedoms and flexibilities' instead to achieve spend in year, subject to section 151 officer approval;	

ITEM	ACTION
• As the advance was not connected to submitted project spend profiles, the 5% target was at local programme level and there was no 5% 'cap' on project spend, nor a requirement for all projects to contribute to it; • Towns Fund financial profiles should continue to reflect project profiles (i.e. business cases) and should not be amended to reflect the 5% where sufficient project spend was not available – this was consistent with the approach which had been taken in the draft financial profile submitted to MHCLG on 31st August; and • Where a Local Authority makes 'advance' payments to external project delivery bodies in 2021/22, MHCLG consider this would count as spend towards the 5% requirement. These clarifications had allowed for a wider range of options to be considered for meeting the spend requirement, reducing the risks associated with acceleration of activities originally planned for future years, whist also minimising any impact on project Business Cases. In view of the information presented, the following approach had been recommended, which utilised both existing profiled spend and made use of the option to 'advance' payments to projects:- 1. **Existing profiled project spend:** This would be applied to projects delivered directly by the Accountable Body (Housing Renewal, Place Development & Marina Village), where spend on project development included payments to external suppliers (e.g. consultants and other professional fees). There may also be potential for the value of 'commitment' under contracts entered into for delivery to contribute towards the 5% target if signed in 2021/22; 2. **Other programme-related spend:** Again, this related to spend by the Accountable Body directly and related to contracts with external suppliers relating to development of business cases programme support functions. A large proportion of this spend had already occurred, albeit a (relatively) small amount in terms of the 5% target; and 3. **Advance payments to external project delivery bodies:** Utilising the flexibility provided by MHCLG, advance payments of between 5-10% of Town Deal allocation could be made in respect of projects delivered by organisations external to the Accountable Body (University of Cumbria and Cumbria County Council).	

ITEM	ACTION
The combination of these three steps, with the varying advances approach used under step 3, had potential to provide spend of £1,420,269 which would exceed the 5% requirement (as currently forecast) by £238,769. A key consideration when considering payments to meet the 5% target was the confirmation by MHCLG that clawback would not be sought on any element of the 5% advance paid to projects which, for whatever reason, do not subsequently proceed. It should be noted however, that by the time advance payments to projects would be expected, the business case assurance process would be complete, and the results considered by the Brilliant Barrow Board prior to submission of Town Deal Summary Documents to MHCLG. In view of the emerging issues and changing requirements outlined above and with Barrow being amongst the first tranche of Town Deal submissions, this had meant that Business Cases had required re-working at a critical point in the programme. Sam Plum wished to place on record her thanks to the teams supporting the Borough Council through this process. Julie Mennell had abstained from voting on this matter due to her conflict of interest. RESOLVED:- (i) To note the requirement to define Programme Management resource and agree the recommended approach of amending existing project funding allocations as outlined above; and (ii) To note the planned approach, outlined above, to meeting the MHCLG requirement for early capital spend in the 2021/2022 financial year. **21– Programme and Risk Update** <u>Business Case Development</u> Michael Barry advised that the development of project Business Cases had now reached an advance stage, with all Business Cases having been submitted into the local assurance process by mid-August. The assurance process was ongoing and once concluded, Business Cases would be updated where necessary to reflect any amendments or clarifications provided during the process.	

ITEM	ACTION
Work Programme Michael Barry advised that to enable submission of the Town Deal Summary Document to MHCLG in November 2021 (12 months from signing the Heads of Terms), the high-level programme for the Business Case phase of the Town Deal included the following key stages:- • Business Case development support in place – February; • Project development governance structures in place – March; • Project development technical support in place – April; • Draft Business Cases submitted for initial review – May; • Final Business Cases submitted for project assurance – July/August; • Project assurance process complete – September/October; • Board consideration of project assurance – October; and • Submission of Town Deal Summary document to MHCLG – November. It had been noted that progress remained broadly in line with the high-level programme and work continued to monitor and support the activities of each Project Delivery Body. In view of the revised guidance received from MHCLG as detailed under Agenda Item No. 7 (Minute No. 20 refers), it had been noted that the programme required varying degrees of re-working to Business Cases, to work within the new financial requirements and that In turn, this would extend the period required to conclude Business Case assurance. Michael advised that at the outset, the agreed work programme had allowed for an extended period of contingency between the Brilliant Barrow Board date of 11th October and the Accountable Body Executive Committee scheduled for 10th November. Use of this contingency was now considered necessary, to ensure that final 'assured' Business Cases and Town Deal Summary Documents reflected the amendments now required. It had therefore been recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board scheduled for 11th October should moved to the later date of 22nd October. The Work Programme had been updated to reflect that and had been included as an appendix to the report. In addition to the main Work Programme concerning Business Case Assurance, Michael advised that a number of other pieces of work were ongoing for submission to MHCLG alongside the Town Deal	

ITEM	ACTION
Summary Document in November, or earlier as required, including:- • **Programme financial profile:** An updated draft profile, based on business cases received into assurance, had been submitted to MHCLG on 31st August. The final financial profile, which would be used by MHCLG to determine annual programme payments to the Accountable Body, was required by 27th September. The final profile would reflect any amendments identified through the assurance process; • **Project Adjustment Forms:** The development of full Business Cases has inevitably led to some degree of change from the project details originally confirmed to MHCLG in January, in response to Town Deal Heads of Terms. Discussions with MHCLG were ongoing to determine what level of justification would be required, if any, to accompany the submission of Town Deal Summary Documents in November. Where justification was required, Project Adjustment Forms would be submitted and would draw from the detail included in Business Cases; • **Final Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Plan:** A draft M&E Plan had been submitted to MHCLG on 30th April and feedback received had not raised any significant issues. The M&E Plan was currently being updated, to reflect the detail provided in Business Cases and would be finalised following completion of the assurance process. The final version would be submitted to MHCLG alongside the Town Deal Summary Documents; • **Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis (PSED)**: The PSED required public bodies (including all Local Authorities receiving Towns Fund) to consider how their Town Investment Plan and projects would affect people who were protected under the Equality Act 2010. Although considered in the design of projects and in Business Cases, the requirement for a separate analysis had been included as a condition in the Town Deal Heads of Terms. The Accountable Body had been leading on that assessment, drawing on existing approaches and reflecting the detail in project Business Cases, with additional input from Project Leads as required. The completed PSED Analysis would be submitted to MHCLG alongside the Town Deal Summary Documents.	

ITEM	ACTION
Business Case Development & Assurance – Risk Management The Programme Risk Register had been included as an appendix to the report. It identified the key programme-level risks with potential to impact on the development of final project Business Cases, the project assurance process and ultimately the submission, and subsequent MHCLG approval of, the Town Deal Summary Document. The key risks revolved around the work of Project Delivery Bodies and the inputs required to complete Business Cases and meet the requirements set out in the Government's Green Book. Supporting that were the interactions between the Accountable Body, Project Delivery Bodies and Government. In addition, external factors such as the requirement for statutory permissions, match funding contributions and the ongoing impacts of Covid-19 had been addressed. It had been noted that each Project Delivery Body was responsible for maintaining an appropriate project-level risk register for their respective projects. Project Business Cases included a full project risk register which was subject to review as part of the assurance process. Conclusions from the assurance process, to be reported to the October Brilliant Barrow Board, would outline what were considered the key risks in relation to each project and, where possible, those risks would be mitigated by recommended conditions to be included with project grant funding agreements. The Chair stated that it was good to see no 'Red' risks, as well as strong mitigating comments against the 'Green' risks. Julie Mennell highlighted additional potential financial risks in view of the imminent spending review as well as inflation and the increase in National Insurance contributions. The Chair agreed that these were risks to be aware of, although mitigations might be limited. Allison Hatcher added that individual projects may no longer be affordable which presented a risk to the programme. Jo Lappin added that she could not see any risks related to Local Government Reorganisation and questioned if it would be an issue. Michael Barry had agreed to review the change process (should it be required) and report back at the next meeting.	Michael Barry

ITEM	ACTION
RESOLVED:- (i) To note the progress made in relation to the Business Case Assurance Work Programme and proposed amendments included at Appendix A to the report; (ii) To agree the recommendation to amend the date of the October Brilliant Barrow Board to 22nd October; and (iii) To note the Programme Risk Register included at Appendix B to the report and the comments made by the Board outlined above. **22 – Communications Update** Alec Proffitt, the Council's Policy and Engagement Officer and Chair of the Communications and Engagement Group provided a verbal update on the communications and engagement activity as follows:- <u>Strategic Comms and Engagement</u> • Fortnightly Comms and Engagement Group meetings had been diarised; • Actions from those meetings were circulated to Comms Leads; • Monthly written reports had been requested from Comms Leads; and • Project specific meetings to be held on a monthly basis and attended by Comms, Project and Futures Board Leads. <u>Link with Futures Board and Young Voices</u> • A Futures Board representative had been linked to each project to assist with the development and implementation of the individual project plans; • A standing agenda item had been included on the Comms and Engagement Group meetings to ensure that the influence and ideas of young people in the project design and delivery was made a reality; • A number of meetings had taken place for each separate project and had been attended by the Project and Comms Leads, together with the relevant representative from the Futures Board; • Meetings would continue to be arranged on a monthly basis to ensure input from Futures Board throughout project development and delivery; and	

ITEM	ACTION

- Futures Board representatives had been invited to attend fortnightly Comms and Engagement meetings to improve communications and ensure there were no missed opportunities.

Project Activity

- All projects were progressing well;
- Regular meetings had been set up and attended by Project, Comms and Futures Board Leads;
- Comms and Engagement Team would continue to work together to identify opportunities for joint and project specific engagement activities;
- Once Business Cases had been finalised, Comms and Engagement Group planned to share social media updates on all projects; and
- Town Deal Open Day would be delivered once Business Cases had gone through assurance.

Social Media Update

TWITTER	August 2021	Previous Month's Figures (July 2021)
Followers	580	555
Impressions	14,900	22,800
Engagements	325	434
Mentions	65	84
Profile Visits	615	954
Retweets	42	51
Link Click/Web Traffic	58	39
Likes	105	136

FACEBOOK	August 2021	Previous Month's Figures (July 2021)
Followers	1,304	1,256
Page Likes	1,253	1,209
Post Reach	11,513	12,206
Engagement	879	454

RESOLVED:- To note the information.

ITEM	ACTION
23 – Levelling Up and Community Renewal Fund Sam Plum advised that no decision had been made on either of these funding bids. It had been considered that they may be wrapped into the comprehensive spending review due at the end of October. In respect of the Community Renewal Fund where funded needed to be spent by 31st March, 2021, she advised that the Council had been asked if they were to be offered the funding, would they be able to spend it by the required deadline. Her reply had been that if a decision was received by 1st October then yes, if not, it would be unlikely that the full allocation could be spent by the end of March. Jo Lappin asked Allison Hatcher to provide an update on Community Renewal Fund across the County. Allison advised that all applicants had been asked what their position was and would feed back to MHCLG. RESOLVED:- To note the information. **24 – Any Other Business** <u>Learning Quarter</u> In the absence of Andrew Wren, Julie Mennell advised that he was expected to be called for an interview within the next month regarding the connectivity of Furness College and the Institute of Technology for Cumbria. <u>Towns Deals Across the County</u> The Chair advised that in order to share best practice across the county, it had been suggested that Chairs from other Towns Deal Boards could be invited to our Board. The Board had agreed with that. **25 – Date of Next Meeting** The next meeting would be held at 9:00am on Friday 22nd October, 2021. The meeting closed at 12:50pm.	

BRILLIANT BARROW BOARD	Agenda Item No. 6
Date of Meeting: 22 October 2021	
Reporting Officer: Senior Manager Economy and Place – Cumbria CC	

Title: Work Programme & Risk Update

Summary and Conclusions:

Following the Heads of Terms agreement there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to Government for consideration. Government needs to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

Business cases are not submitted to Government and responsibility for ensuring business cases meet the required 'Green Book' standard lies with the local Accountable Body (Barrow Borough Council). The results of this local assurance process must be reflected in the Summary Document, which must be submitted to Government within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

Supporting this activity, a work programme and a programme risk register have been developed. The work programme maps out the assurance process up to submission of the Summary Document. The risk register identifies key risks to delivery of the work programme and how these are being managed.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board:

1. Note progress in relation to the Work Programme **(Appendix A)** and the identified next steps; and
2. Note and provide comment on the Programme Risk Register **(Appendix B).**

Report

Following the Heads of Terms agreement there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to Government for consideration. Government needs to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

Business cases are not submitted to Government and responsibility for ensuring business cases meet the required 'Green Book' standard lies with the local Accountable Body (Barrow Borough Council). The results of this local assurance process must be reflected in the Summary Document, which must be submitted to Government within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

Supporting this activity, a work programme and a programme risk register have been developed. The work programme maps out the assurance process up to submission of the Summary Document. The risk register identifies key risks to delivery of the work programme and how these are being managed.

Work Programme

To enable submission of the Town Deal Summary document to Government in November 2021 (12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms), the high-level programme for the business case phase of the Town Deal includes the following key stages:

- Business case development support in place – February
- Project development governance structures in place – March
- Project development technical support in place – April
- Draft business cases submitted for initial review – May
- Final business cases submitted for project assurance – July/August
- Business Case assurance process complete – September/October
- Board consideration of Business Case assurance – October
- Submission of Town Deal Summary document to Government - November

A detailed work programme covering the business case assurance phase and preparation for the submission of the Town Deal Summary Document is provided at **Appendix A**.

Progress is in line with the work programme, as the conclusions of the assurance process are now being shared with the Board for consideration.

The remaining stages in the work programme concern finalisation of the business case assurance process and preparation of the package of documents required for submission to Government, following consideration by the Board and the completion of Accountable Body internal governance. Further detail on these stages is provided below and in the papers which follow.

Business Case Assurance

In line with the agreed Local Assurance Framework, project business case assurance has now been undertaken. The conclusions from the assurance process are presented to the Board for consideration under **Item 7.**

The assurance process is necessary to ensure that business cases have been developed in compliance with HM Treasury 'Green Book' requirements and follow the approved '5 case' methodology. The assurance process also assesses the level of risk associated with the delivery of each project and identifies any risks which require appropriate mitigation, for example through the inclusion of specific assurance conditions, to manage the level of risk to the programme and Accountable Body. The assurance process includes input from the Accountable Body's Legal and Finance functions.

The assurance process has in some cases required clarifications and additional information to be provided in support of business cases, or amendments to the detail of businesses cases has been required. Following agreement of the assurance findings, a final review and refinement of each business case is to be carried out, to ensure all updates are reflect in the final 'assured' business cases. In most cases this work is already underway and will be complete prior to the Accountable Body's Executive Committee on 10th November. This is important as, although business cases are not submitted to Government with the Summary Document, they do remain subject to 'call-in' by Government during the review process.

Next Steps – Submission

The conclusion of the work programme is the submission of Town Deal Summary Documents and accompanying information to Government, which must take place within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

Subject to review by the Board of the assurance process findings and the package of documents required by Government, submission will take place following the Accountable Body's Executive Committee on 10th November.

Details of the package of documents which make up the submission are provided under **Item 8.**

Following submission, Government will review the documentation provided and this may lead to requests for clarifications or adjustments to be made to some aspects of the documentation. Current guidance from Government provides an indicative timetable for the consideration of Town Deal Summaries and accompanying documents, prior to release of first annual funding allocations. This suggests that submissions received by Government between mid-October 2021 and mid-January 2022 will be processed and payments released by the end of March 2022. Although the Barrow submission falls early within this window in mid-November, there is no

indication from Government that a payment turnaround earlier than March 2022 should be expected.

It should be noted however that the timetable relates to the period required to review submissions and make payments. Discussions with Government have indicated that it may be possible to provide some form of notification to the Accountable Body, once the review process concludes that no amendments or clarifications are required to the documentation submitted. While this may be some weeks before payment is received, it would nevertheless be valuable to receive such a confirmation and would mark a significant step towards implementation of the Town Investment Plan. This knowledge would also provide additional comfort to both the Accountable Body and Project Delivery Bodies, as development work and preparation for delivery will continue to be advanced 'at risk' by all parties during this period.

Risk Management

Supporting the programme of business case development and assurance, a Programme Risk Register is maintained which identifies key risks to the agreed work programme and how these are being managed. The Programme Risk Register is provided at **Appendix B.**

The risk register identifies the key programme-level risks with potential to impact on the development of final project business cases, the project assurance process and ultimately the submission, and subsequent Government approval of, the Town Deal Summary Document. The key risks revolve around the work of Project Delivery Bodies and the inputs required to complete business cases and meet the requirements set out in the Government's Green Book. Supporting this are the interactions between the Accountable Body, Project Delivery Bodies and Government. In addition, external factors such as the requirement for statutory permissions, match funding contributions and the ongoing impacts of Covid-19 are addressed.

Each Project Delivery Body is responsible for maintaining an appropriate project-level risk register for their respective projects. Project business cases include a full project risk register which are subject to review as part of the assurance process. Conclusions from the assurance process outline what are considered the key risks in relation to each project and, where possible, these risks will be mitigated by recommended conditions to be included with project grant funding agreements.

End.

Appendix A: Business Case Assurance Work Programme
Appendix B: Programme Risk Register

Barrow TIP - Business Case Assurance Programme

	Action	Start	End	Week Ending: 16/07/21	23/07/21	30/07/21	06/08/21	13/08/21	20/08/21	27/08/21	03/09/21	10/09/21	17/09/21	24/09/21	01/10/21	08/10/21	15/10/21	22/10/21	29/10/21	05/11/21	12/11/21	19/11/21
1	Project Leads submit Final Business Cases to Barrow BC (Accountable Body) and Programme Management Office (PMO)	16/07/2021	~~13/08/2021~~ 16/08/2021																			
2	Business Cases subject to initial review by PMO and fundamental queries shared with Project Leads	19/07/2021	~~20/08/2021~~ 27/08/2021																			
3	PMO assessments undertaken	19/07/2021	03/09/2021																			
4	PMO raise detailed queries with Project Leads	26/07/2021	03/09/2021																			
5	Project Leads prepare and submit responses to PMO queries	02/08/2021	17/09/2021																			
6	PMO review project responses and complete draft assessments	20/09/2021	01/10/2021																			
7	Project Leads (and support) amend business cases to reflect 1) assurance responses where necessary 2) revised Town Deal allocations (subject to Board agreement on 23/09)	13/09/2021	27/09/2021																			
8	Accountable Body identify project changes to BEIS/MHCLG - for decision on requirement for Project Adjustment Forms	20/09/2021	08/10/2021																			
9	PMO assessments finalised, including internal QA and any recommended conditions	28/09/2021	08/10/2021																			
10	PMO sends completed assessments to Accountable Body for legal and finance review, including any additional conditions	04/10/2021	08/10/2021																			
11	Accountable Body & PMO agree final assessments & board papers (including Town Deal Summary Documents & other items for submission)	11/10/2021	14/10/2021																			
12	Brilliant Barrow Board papers issued	15/10/2021	15/10/2021																			
13	Brilliant Barrow Board Meeting - to consider results of assurance (including Town Deal Summary Documents) - Assumed date subject to Board agreement on 23/09	22/10/2021	22/10/2021																			
14	Preparation & issue of papers for Barrow BC Accountable Body Governance.	25/10/2021	29/10/2021																			
15	Accountable Body Governance - formal acceptance of assured business cases & approval of Town Deal Summary Document (anticipated to be 10/11/2021 Executive Committee)	01/11/2021	12/11/2021																			
16	Submission of Town Deal Summary Document to BEIS / MHCLG (Latest)	15/11/2021	17/11/2021																			

Colours Key:

- **Project Leads within project delivery organisations**
- **Local Town Deal Programme Management Office (PMO)**
- **Barrow Borough Council - Accountable Body**
- **BEIS / MHCLG**

Barrow TIP Development - Programme Risk Register

Updated:	14/10/21

Risk No.	Risk Detail	Mitigating Actions	Owner	Actions Update	Likelihood (1 to 5)	Impact (1 to 5)	Risk Rating
1	There is a risk that completion of stage 2 project business cases could be delayed, caused by a lack of capacity and/or co-ordination, resulting in delayed project assurance and delayed submission of the Town Deal Summary document and therefore the potential loss of Towns Fund allocation.	The Accountable Body will procure a single lead consultant to work across the 7 TIP projects, leading on preparation of business cases with input from project delivery bodies, to ensure consistency of approach and to control quality.	Accountable Body	All business cases are now complete and are currently in the assurance process, which is nearing its conclusion. Hatch support has been retained to assist project leads in the response to assurance queries and any required amendments to business cases prior to final 'assured' business cases being agreed.	2	4	
2	There is a risk that required inputs from project delivery bodies could be delayed, incomplete or fail to meet requirements, caused by a lack of capacity or relevant expertise within project delivery bodies, resulting in delays to completion of business cases and project assurance.	The Accountable Body and PMO will work with each project delivery body to ensure the required technical support is procured and that all necessary technical inputs (design, costings etc) are provided, in a timeframe compatible with key stages of business case development.	Project Delivery Body SROs	The key technical inputs required to develop projects have been received and incorporated into business cases. Appropriate technical support remains in place where required, to continue project development activities 'at risk' prior to final Government approvals and into the delivery phase. Appropriate costs are included within business cases. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery, which have been assessed as part of the assurance process.	1	3	
3	There is a risk that local project assurance cannot be completed within timescales and to the required standard, caused by lack of capacity in the Accountable Body, resulting in failure to submit the Town Deal Summary document or significant Government queries following submission.	The Accountable Body will put in place arrangements with Cumbria County Council to act as the Town Deal Programme Management Office (PMO) which will include the co-ordination of local project assurance (in line with Green Book requirements) and development of a Local Assurance Framework for the Town Deal.	Accountable Body	The SLA between the Accountable Body and Cumbria County Council (PMO) is in place and the assurance process is ongoing. This work is guided by the Programme Assurance Framework approved by the Brilliant Barrow Board & Accountable Body. A work programme for assurance is maintained and progress updates provided to the Board, including where revisions may be necessary.	1	4	
4	There is a risk that the 'General Conditions' and 'Improvement Conditions' set out in the TIP Heads of Terms document (Private Sector Engagement Plan, Compliant Assurance Process & Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis) are not met, caused by delays or incomplete responses being submitted, resulting in delay to Government approval of the Town Deal Summary Document.	The Accountable Body will engage appropriate support to refine and develop the Private Sector Engagement Plan. The Accountable Body and PMO will develop a 'Green Book' compliant project assurance process and the Accountable Body will co-ordinate completion of PSED analysis.	Accountable Body	A Private Sector Engagement Plan was included in the Heads of Terms response submitted to Government in January 2021. A Programme Assurance Framework has been developed and approved by the Brilliant Barrow Board & Accountable Body. Work is underway to complete the PSED analysis, led by the Accountable Body, within the required timescales.	2	3	

Risk No.	Risk Detail	Mitigating Actions	Owner	Actions Update	Likelihood (1 to 5)	Impact (1 to 5)	Risk Rating
5	There is a risk that failure to fully comply with Government Towns Fund Guidance, caused by Brilliant Barrow's position as one of the first approved Town Deals, results in late amendments being required to business cases and/or delays to Government approval of the Town Deal Summary Document.	Maintain regular communication with Government on new and emerging guidance. Draw on experience with other similar programmes where necessary. Work with project delivery bodies to ensure updated guidance is reflected in project development and business cases.	Accountable Body	Recent clarifications and new requirements received from Government, regarding programme management resource and programme cashflow, required varying levels of amendment to all business cases. This additional work has been highlighted to the Brilliant Barrow Board and revisions were made to the work programme to accommodate these requirements, while maintaining progress towards the fixed deadline for submission of the Town Deal Summary Documents to Government.	4	3	
6	There is a risk that projects cannot demonstrate a secured funding package, caused by delays in securing required match funding contributions, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales or failure by Government to approve the Town Deal Summary document.	Ensure match funding requirements are addressed in work programmes and identify key project-level risks. Where funding may not be secured for project assurance, ensure business cases provide sufficient assurance on progress and risks. Project-level risks relating to funding packages will be escalated to programme-level as required.	Project Delivery Body SROs	All project business cases identify a full funding package, however in some cases this funding is not yet confirmed. Regular contact between the PMO and Project delivery bodies continues to monitor progress. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery, which have been assessed as part of the assurance process. The assurance process identifies where appropriate conditions may be used to mitigate risk to the programme. At this stage, no significant risk of projects failing to secure the intended match funding requires escalation to the Programme Risk Register, however the current status of some projects has been highlighted as a risk in the conclusions of the assurance process.	3	4	

Risk No.	Risk Detail	Mitigating Actions	Owner	Actions Update	Likelihood (1 to 5)	Impact (1 to 5)	Risk Rating
7	There is a risk that projects cannot provide sufficient assurance with regards to deliverability, caused by delays or failures to obtain planning consents or provide sufficient confidence in planning status, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales or failure by Government to approve the Town Deal Summary document.	Ensure planning is addressed in work programmes and identify key project-level risks. Where full planning will not be in place for project assurance, project delivery bodies should undertake early engagement with planning authorities, to ensure business cases provide a clear planning strategy with assurance on progress, risks and timescales. Accountable Body and PMO to work to manage expectations of Government while providing assurance. Project-level risks relating to planning will be escalated to programme-level as required.	Project Delivery Body SROs	Comfort has been received from Government on flexibilities, with clear planning strategies acceptable in the Town Deal Summary document, where full planning will not be in place. Where planning is required, business cases present a clear timeline for achievement and letters of comfort have been obtained from the planning authority. Manageable planning risks can be addressed through appropriate conditions in conclusions from project assurance and subsequent project funding agreements. At this stage no project-level risks require escalation. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery, which have been assessed as part of the assurance process.	3	4	
8	There is a risk that projects cannot provide sufficient assurance with regards to deliverability, caused by delays or failures to secure sites required for projects, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales or failure by Government to approve the Town Deal Summary document.	Establish clear strategies and timescales for securing sites where this is a requirement. Accountable Body and PMO to work with project delivery bodies to monitor progress and level of risk. Project-level risks relating to sites will be escalated to programme-level as required.	Project Delivery Body SROs	All projects have sites identified and delivery bodies have confirmed their ability to secure sites within the required timescales, however in some cases the assurance process has highlighted the need for additional clarity and/or comfort. The assurance process identifies where appropriate conditions may be used to mitigate risk to the programme. At this stage, no significant risk of projects failing to secure sites requires escalation to the Programme Risk Register, however the current status of some projects has been highlighted as a risk in the conclusions of the assurance process.	2	4	
9	There is a risk that final business cases are not consistent with details provided to government in the TIP and Heads of Terms response, caused by changes made during business case development, resulting in delays or failure to receive Government approval of the Town Deal Summary document.	Government have initiated a change notification process, recognising that changes are likely to occur as business cases develop from submission of TIPs and Heads of Terms. Potential for change should be monitored and where necessary, notifications provided to Government at the appropriate time.	Accountable Body	Amendments and refinements to the detail of projects, as a result of full business case development, together with recent amendments to project funding allocations, has led to some degree of variation from the Heads of Terms details. These changes are not considered 'significant' however communication is ongoing with Government regarding how change notifications should be handled. It is now expected that narrative around changes will be required by Government, prior to submission of the Town Deal Summary Documents.	4	3	

Risk No.	Risk Detail	Mitigating Actions	Owner	Actions Update	Likelihood (1 to 5)	Impact (1 to 5)	Risk Rating
10	There is a risk that projects cannot demonstrate compliance with subsidy control frameworks, caused by uncertainty around the new UK subsidy regime, resulting in delays or failure to receive Government approval of the Town Deal Summary document.	Accountable Body & PMO to work with each project delivery body to ensure potential subsidy implications are identified. Ensure development programmes allow sufficient time to receive appropriate legal advice and identify potential issues, with corrective actions as necessary.	Project Delivery Body SROs	Business cases include an assessment of project activities with regards to subsidy control. The Accountable Body commissioned independent legal advice to assess each project, which has led to some minor revisions to business cases. The review did not identify any significant risks with regards to subsidy control (i.e. which would require substantial modification to projects). The Accountable Body is also receiving advice on reporting and monitoring implications, where notification of support to projects is required under subsidy control transparency rules.	2	4	
11	There is a risk that project development may be impacted by additional restrictions to working practices, caused by current and future responses to the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in delays to the completion of business cases.	Establish remote working arrangements, regular meeting cycles and early identification of potential impacts. Ensure sufficient consideration is given to COVID in project level risk management and programming of project development tasks.	Project Delivery Body SROs	Project lead bodies are established in remote working, regular meetings take place and impacts on business case development have been managed. There may be potential for some impact to 'on site' technical work supporting project development, however this is also considered manageable. As projects move from development to delivery, the potential impacts will change and will require review. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery, which have been assessed as part of the assurance process.	2	2	
12	There is a risk that business cases do not demonstrate the level of public support and engagement required for Town Deals, caused by delayed, incomplete or inconclusive public engagement, resulting in failure to meet the expectations of Government and the ambitions reflected in the Town Investment Plan.	Agree a clear strategy to build on the public engagement which underpinned the TIP, with co-ordination by the Brilliant Barrow Communications & Engagement Group. Ensure a Communications & Engagement Plan is in place for each TIP project, enabling final business cases to demonstrate the required level of public engagement within the strategic case. Build on existing use of Brilliant Barrow online and social media platforms.	Communications & Engagement Group	The Comms & Engagement Group meets fortnightly, receiving updates on project level activities. Comms & Engagement Plans are in place where engagement has been required to support business cases. Some more detailed engagement can only take place later in the development phase, once funding is confirmed. Brilliant Barrow platforms are being utilised both to inform the public of developments and as a method of engagement through surveys etc.	2	3	

Risk No.	Risk Detail	Mitigating Actions	Owner	Actions Update	Likelihood (1 to 5)	Impact (1 to 5)	Risk Rating
13	There is a risk that preparations for (and the implementation of) Local Government Reform impacts on the governance and resourcing required to ensure successful delivery of the Town Investment Plan and its projects.	Ensure effective project and programme governance is being followed by all organisations supporting delivery of the TIP and the use of the Brilliant Barrow Board to support decision making.	Accountable Body	At this stage, LGR is recognised as a risk at programme-level, with potential to impact overall governance and resourcing. Project business cases do not directly address LGR risks to delivery, on the basis that delivery will be governed through multi-year funding agreements securing the necessary resources, transferred through due process as necessary, where any changes to structure of the Funder or Recipient occur as a result of LGR implementation.	3	4	

Agenda Item No. 7

Brilliant Barrow Board – 22nd October, 2021

Business Case Assurance – Not for Publication

This item has been excluded from the public and press on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part One of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 and Access to Information (Variation) Order 2006.

BRILLIANT BARROW BOARD	Agenda Item No. 8
Date of Meeting: 22 October 2021	
Reporting Officer: Senior Manager Economy and Place – Cumbria CC	

Title: Draft Town Deal Submission

Summary and Conclusions:

Following the Heads of Terms agreement there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to Government for consideration. Government needs to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

The Town Deal Summary Document and accompanying supporting documents must be submitted to Government within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

This paper sets out the package of documents, currently in draft form, which will be submitted to Government, following consideration by the Board and the Accountable Body's Executive Committee on 10th November. The content of the submission is guided by requirements set out in the Heads of Terms and subsequent communications received from Government, as national Towns Fund programme guidance has developed.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board:

1. Note and provide comment on the content of the draft submission, as set out in the **Appendices A to D**;
2. Note the areas of the draft submission where further refinements and updates will be incorporated, prior to finalisation; and
3. Provide a recommendation to the Accountable Body Executive Committee, to enable the submission of all documents to Government prior to 17th November.

Report

Following the Heads of Terms agreement there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to Government for consideration. Government needs to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

The Town Deal Summary Document and accompanying supporting documents must be submitted to Government within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

This paper sets out the package of documents, currently in draft form, which will be submitted to Government, following consideration by the Board and the Accountable Body's Executive Committee on 10th November. The content of the submission is guided by requirements set out in the Heads of Terms and subsequent communications received from Government, as national Towns Fund programme guidance has developed.

In summary, the package of documents to be submitted consists of:

1. Town Deal Summary Part 1: Project Summary Documents
2. Town Deal Summary Part 2: TIP Improvement Conditions
3. Programme Financial Profile
4. Programme Monitoring & Evaluation Plan
5. Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis

Town Deal Summary Part 1: Project Summary Documents

The Town Deal Summary is a template provided by Government and is used to submit final details of approved projects to Government for endorsement. In conjunction with information provided in the financial profile and monitoring and evaluation plan, Part 1 of the summary document sets out the key information on each project within the Town Investment Plan, following the completion of full business cases and reflecting the results of the local assurance process. The summary documents require sign-off from the Board Chair and the Accountable Body.

The Part 1 document consists of the following sections:

Section		**Information Required**
1	Project Name	Project title consistent with TIP.
2	Heads of Terms Project Conditions	Details of how any project-specific conditions included within the Heads of Terms letter have been addressed.
3	Business Case Appraisal	Details of the local assurance process undertaken on the project business case.

4	MHCLG Capital 5% Payment[1]	Details of how the project will contribute to utilising the 5% advance capital payment made to Accountable Bodies for 2021/22. Note the 5% advance is at programme-level and the level of contribution from each project can vary.
5	Quantified benefit-cost ratio (value for money)	Detail the Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR) calculated for the project and summarise the project outcomes.
6	Deliverability	Confirmation that the project can be delivered within Towns Fund timescales i.e. by March 2026.
7	Delivery Plan	Details of project milestones, delivery partnerships, key risks and mitigations, constraints and dependencies.
8	Town Deal Board Chair Sign-off	Sign-off to confirm that a compliant business case has been provided, that the project represents value for money and that other key documents have been provided where applicable.
9	Accountable Body Sign-off	

[1]The approach to managing the 5% capital advance was agreed by the Board on 23rd September.

Draft summary documents for each of the 7 projects within the Town Investment Plan are provided at **Appendix A1 through to A7**.

Section 3 (Business Case Appraisal) in the draft summary documents is not currently populated. This is primarily to avoid duplication with the details of project assurance, which are presented for Board consideration under **Item 7**. Once reviewed by the Board and following any required amendments, details of the results of the assurance process, including any agreed conditions, will be inserted into section 3.

Please note, the summary documents will remain in draft form until they are provided to the Accountable Body's Executive Committee for approval to submit to Government. Summaries will be updated where any assurance conditions are cleared in advance of submission.

Town Deal Summary Part 2: TIP Improvement Conditions

Part 2 of the Town Deal Summary relates to the Town Investment Plan 'Improvement Conditions' which were included in the Heads of Terms. Details are required as to how the conditions have been addressed and again sign-off is required from the Board Chair and Accountable Body.

These conditions were:

1. Barrow should conduct project assurance in line with agreed routes for each individual project; and
2. Barrow should provide a plan for continued and varied private sector engagement.

Documents have previously been provided to Government to address both conditions. The 21st May 2021 meeting of the Town Deal Board endorsed the draft Local Assurance Framework, which was subsequently approved at the June meeting of the Accountable Body's Executive Committee and submitted to Government. A Private Sector Engagement Plan, building on details provided in the Town Investment Plan, was produced in December 2020 and submitted to Government as part of the initial response to Heads of Terms, in January 2021.

A draft Part 2 summary document is provided at **Appendix B**.

Copies of the Local Assurance Framework and Private Sector Engagement Plan have not been provided with Appendix B, as these are unchanged from those previously shared with the Board.

Programme Financial Profile

The programme financial profile (full title: TIP Appendix A-1 – Financial Information) is a template provided by Government and is used to set out how the £25m Towns Fund allocation to the Town Investment Plan will be utilised, building on previous drafts and project allocations confirmed in the Heads of Terms.

The profile shows the financial allocation to each project, split by capital (CDEL) and revenue (RDEL) funding streams and broken down into financial years to 2025/26. The profile reflects only Towns Fund contributions and does not set out the match funding associated with each project.

As agreed by the Board on 23rd September, the financial profile now reflects adjustments to previous project allocations, in response to feedback from Government, to enable just under £500,000 of the overall £25m TIP allocation to be used to support the costs of ongoing programme management by the Accountable Body.

Final confirmation of the programme financial profile was required earlier than other documents and was submitted to Government on 27th September. The profile is provided for information at **Appendix C**.

Although submission of the final programme profile pre-dated the completion of business case assurance, the profile reflects the financial details set out in business cases and any amendments required as a result of assurance up to that point. Although the finalisation of business case assurance may lead to

variances in the annual spend forecasts within business cases, projects must continue to work within the parameters of the programme financial profile as submitted. No significant issues have been identified in this regard, either because variances are minor, or because projects are able to use match funding contributions to manage fluctuations.

Programme Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

In April this year, Government published details of the monitoring and evaluation framework to be utilised nationally for the Towns Fund, including a template Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Plan. The framework provides a list of common indicators, across the themes of Transport, Digital Connectivity, Urban Regeneration and Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure. The indicators must be used, as appropriate, to detail the activities and achievements (outputs and outcomes) to be delivered by projects. Indicators are also included at programme level, covering items such as spend, project completions and local capacity. The Accountable Body and TIP projects will be required to report on progress against the M&E Plan indicators at 6 monthly and 12 monthly intervals, for the duration of the Town Deal programme.

An initial draft M&E Plan was submitted to Government on 30th April and no significant issues were identified in the feedback received.

The M&E Framework has been used during business case development and in the business case assurance process, to ensure that projects contribute to the appropriate common indicators and align with the definitions and reporting requirements set out in the framework. Projects also have the freedom to include 'bespoke' indicators in addition to the framework indicators, where this more accurately reflects project outputs and outcomes.

The latest draft M&E Plan is provided at **Appendix D**.

The M&E Plan remains in draft form at present. This is to allow for final amendments to be made, as relevant conditions from the assurance process are addressed and the quantification of some indicators is clarified, prior to being provided to the Accountable Body's Executive Committee for approval to submit to Government. The M&E Plan will remain to some extent a 'live' document and may be subject to further amendments following submission, as a result of feedback from Government.

Finally, it should be noted that the M&E Plan also requires details of how the £750,000 'Accelerated Towns Fund' provided in summer 2020 has been utilised. As the design and implementation of these activities pre-dated publication of the M&E framework, data on common indicators was not collected. The M&E Plan therefore only reflects high-level details of these activities and only include the indicator concerning '£ spent on project delivery'.

Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires public bodies (including all local authorities receiving Towns Fund) to consider how their Town Investment Plan and projects affect groups who are protected under the Equality Act 2010. The Heads of Terms included a 'general condition' which requires submission of a PSED analysis at both project and programme level, alongside the Town Deal Summary Documents.

While the PSED has been reflected in the design of projects and business cases reflect relevant organisational policies, template documents have been provided by Government which aim to draw out the required details from business cases into a separate report. An assessment of these project-level reports is then carried out to inform a programme-level report, which also reflects on how the Town Investment Plan as a whole can promote equality and deliver positive impacts.

The assessment has been co-ordinated by the Accountable Body, drawing on existing approaches and reflecting the detail in project business cases, while also incorporating additional input from project leads as required.

A draft of the project and programme level assessments is currently being finalised. This will be shared with the Board for information, prior to being provided to the Accountable Body's Executive Committee for approval to submit to Government.

End.

Appendices A1 – A7: Draft Town Deal Summary Part 1: Project Summary Documents
Appendix B: Draft Town Deal Summary Part 2: TIP Improvement Conditions
Appendix C: Final Programme Financial Profile (as submitted 27th September)
Appendix D: Draft Programme Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Barrow Learning Quarter
2. Heads of Terms project conditions – Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. – Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.
No conditions were attached to this project within the Heads of Terms.
3. Business case appraisal Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including: – business case type – any internal or external assurances
Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.
4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment
The spend profile allocates £296,667 of Towns Fund towards capital expenditure in 2021/22, from a total annual capital spend of £491,667. This spend is in part to support business case development and also supports scheme design to RIBA stage 3.
5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value) A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.
The value for money of the Barrow Learning Quarter project is considered 'high' with a Benefit Cost ratio (BCR) of 3.4.

		Preferred option (net of reference case)
A	Net Present Social Value (£m)	48.8
B	Public sector cost (£m, discounted with optimism bias)	13.7
C	Private sector cost (£m, discounted with optimism bias)	2.3

D	Appropriate Benefits Cost Ratio (A – C) / B	3.4
	Time horizon and reason	20 years - covers the entire development process and both the University Campus and Skills Centre reaching full student capacity

Optimism Bias of 24% was applied to the capital cost of delivering the project.

The monetised benefit is entirely driven by the increased productivity of the local labour force in Barrow. The Barrow Learning Quarter will:

- Bring a higher education campus into the heart of Barrow and provide courses for over 1,400 learners per year once at full capacity
- Increase the capacity of Furness College's rating Lane campus to accommodate 800 students per year (from less than 500)
- Increase the number of college leavers retained within the town on completion of A-Levels or T-levels
- Retain many more highly skilled graduates in the local labour force

A per person/graduate annual productivity uplift of approximately £3,250 or £730 was applied for the impact of every additional undergraduate degree or A-Level qualification (from a previously held A-Level or GCSE qualification, respectively) that was retained in the local labour force. This annual workforce productivity gain was derived from the ONS Human Capital estimates and was assumed to accrue from the point of graduation through to the end of the 20-year appraisal period.

The present value of these productivity gains was £48.8 million, net of deadweight (existing HE and L3 qualifications retained with in the labour force), displacement (25% of increased L3 qualifications assumed to be displacing local residents or other in-commuters from the workforce) and leakage. The retention rate within the Barrow economy for University graduates is assumed to be 70% (30% leakage) due to the severe shortage of higher level skills identified in the Strategic Case. For L3 learners the retention rate was 50%, up from 40% in the reference case – reflecting the increased opportunities for higher education locally.

The project will deliver:

- A Learning Quarter comprised of:
    - A new University Campus on Barrow Island and increased R&D potential in the neighbouring Submarine Academy buildings operated by BAE Systems.
    - A refurbished Rating Lane Campus college campus with increased capacity.
- Over 15,000 new unique learners gaining qualifications within Barrow during the 20-year appraisal period.

Other significant non-monetised benefits include:

- Town centre regeneration – land value uplift from increased footfall and growing resident population
- Opportunities for young people locally
- Improvements in perceptions of Barrow
- R&D spill-overs

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2025/26, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The University of Cumbria and Furness College have been allocated Towns Deal funding to develop a Barrow Learning Quarter. The University of Cumbria is the project lead for the Barrow Learning Quarter. A new university campus will be supported by a rapidly developing partnership with BAE Systems Barrow and a partnership with Furness College that will integrate a skills hub within the college's Rating Lane campus. The university's Strategic Adviser Enterprise and Engagement liaises with the Towns Deal secretariat and is member of the Towns Deal implementation group, as nominated project lead and Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) for the Barrow Learning Quarter.

Furness College and the University of Cumbria will independently deliver their own capital works programmes (with University of Cumbria as the project lead). Once capital works have been completed, the long-term success of the Barrow Learning Quarter project will be managed by the interaction between Furness College and The University of Cumbria.

A Memorandum of Understanding between the two organisations will be based on the following core principles:

1. the two institutions will collaborate to ensure that there are enhanced opportunities to progress on to relevant Higher Education that increases retention of young people and graduates in Barrow, and
2. this collaboration will involve at least 3 components:
    - engagement of Barrow Sixth Form students at the university campus, to enhance awareness and options for HE progression and also to develop employability skills;

- engagement of the University, through its Widening Participation team, in engaging with students at the Sixth Form Centre in order to provide advice and guidance on future HE options;
- engagement of University students in Furness College, via use of the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Centre for practicals and learning opportunities

3. both institutions will have responsibility for delivering the outputs and undertake appropriate governance and financial management for their aspects of the BLQ
4. both parties will work together to ensure that the BLQ operates effectively and maximises the opportunities presented by the partnership and project.

The memorandum of understanding also lays out the responsibilities of Furness College and the University of Cumbria with respect to their contractual obligations under the Towns Fund.

BAE Systems is a strategic sponsor of the project, providing match fund for the capital build, and funding courses and R&D at the campus. BAE Systems will prepare the site for construction and ensure enabling works are undertaken but it is not responsible for the build or operation of the campus, which will sit with the University of Cumbria. The agreement with BAE Systems will contain a Heads of Terms that will determine the overall nature of the partnership, and will be overseen and monitored by a combined oversight group.

The University of Cumbria has also signed a partnership agreement with Lancaster University to support development of the Barrow Learning Quarter. This agreement, which has been approved by both institutions, commits the universities to cooperation on provision of joint teaching, primarily at postgraduate taught masters level, and also collaboration on research and R&D activities with businesses in Barrow.

The main dependencies in the programme relate to:

- **Design work** – both the college refurbishment and new campus have completed RIBA sage 2 designs to date. RIBA 3-7 stages will be required to reach project completion: The University of Cumbria has already commissioned RIBA 3 reports from DAY Architectural.
- **Planning permission** – the University of Cumbria will need planning permission to progress to construction of the new campus. Pre-application discussions have started with the local planning authority and a full planning application is due to be submitted in October 2021.
- **Land Transfer & Site Clearance** – although construction of the new campus will be delivered by the University of Cumbria, this is reliant on the provision of the campus site by BAE Systems. Site clearance, the provision of necessary infrastructure (e.g. substation) and landscaping will be the responsibility of BAE Systems, who have confirmed their commitment to this enabling role. Heads of Terms on site transfer are in development and will be in place in December 2021. The site will then be cleared ready for construction by November 2022.

The key milestones for the Barrow Island campus are:

Stage	Milestone Description	Target End Date
Design	RIBA Stage 3 design	12 November 2021
Planning	Planning Application submitted	26 November 2021
Procurement	Issue Invitation to Tender	16 February 2022
Planning	Planning decision notice	15 March 2022
Procurement	Award contract	21 October 2022
Planning	Planning conditions discharged	10 May 2022
Construction	Site clearance: Building Decant / Asbestos Removal / Demolition / Site Clearance	1 November 2022
Design	RIBA Stage 4 design	14 February 2023
Construction	Construction activities	15 May 2024
Completion	Facility Go-Live date	1 July 2024

The key milestones for the Rating Lane Campus Refurbishment are:

Stage	Milestone Description	Target End Date
Funding	Success of Further Education Capital Transformation Fund (FECTF) bid announced	January 2022
Construction	Work Area 1 – Block F and Block T corridor	March 2022
Building control	Work Area 5 – Block B building control submission	March 2022
Construction	Work Area 2 – Block E and Block T corridor	September 2022
Construction	Work Area 5 -Block B	November 2022
Construction	Work Area 4 -Block A and upper sports	August 2023
Construction	Work Area 3 - Block C - Reception, Independent Study & Sports Changing	February 2024

The key risks associated with the Barrow Learning Quarter project are:

Risk	Mitigation
BLQ - The Learning Quarter does not encourage increased participation in Higher Education	Development of the BLQ to join up sixth form provision and local HE provision, in reach of year 12 and 13 students into BLQ, outreach of UoC staff to year 12 and 13 students and earlier through WP activities, wider awareness raising and development work.
BLQ - The Learning Quarter does not respond to employer needs for higher level skills	Engagement in the Furness Economic Development Forum, strategic partnership with BAE Systems, ongoing consultation with businesses, and skills needs identification surveys and workshops.

UoC Campus - planning application for the new site is delayed or unsuccessful.	Engagement with the planning department pre-application, sharing of design and development programme with planning, contingency in timeline for delays in planning approvals.
UoC Campus - Removal of existing buildings delayed impacting capital build and university operation	Options explored and agreed with BAE Systems, removal of building before building opening confirmed.
UoC funding - External funding decision is delayed or unsuccessful	Funding has been confirmed in principle and allocation made.
FC funding - match funding provided through FECTF is unsuccessful or timing delayed	Proposal developed to optimise prospects of successful award. Options for phasing investment with TD funds applied upfront and remaining investment to follow over longer time period. Alternative sources of funding will also be considered.

The new University Campus and refurbished Furness College campus will be owned and maintained by the University of Cumbria and Furness College, respectively. The land for the new University of Cumbria campus will continue to be owned by BAE Systems albeit granted on a long (99 year) lease to the University.

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.
3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.
4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority: Job title: Name and signature: Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Community Wellbeing Hubs & Earnse Bay Outdoor Centre
2. Heads of Terms project conditions - Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. - Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.
No conditions were attached to this project within the Heads of Terms.
3. Business case appraisal Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including: - business case type - any internal or external assurances
Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.
4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment
The spend profile allocates £195,000 capital expenditure in 2021/22. This spend supports business case development including technical design and costings.
5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value) A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.
The value for money assessment identifies a 'high' Benefit Cost Ratio achieved from the preferred option of 5.8:1.

Economic impacts, net of reference case	Preferred Option (Initial BCR)	Preferred Option (Adjusted BCR)
Present value of costs (£m)	4.4	4.4
Present value of benefits (£m)	25.9	26.4
Benefit Cost Ratio	5.8	6.0

Optimism bias of 20% was used taking into account the upper limit for built projects of 24%, reduced to take into account the experience of the project delivery team in managing large scale projects. After discounting the net present value of costs was £4.4 million.

A net present value of benefits of £25.9 million was derived from a range of benefit streams, uplifted to £26.4m when adjusted to reflect construction activity at the local level.

Benefits (£m)	**Preferred Option (net)**
Social impact of wellbeing improvements (digital inclusion, volunteering, improved sense of belonging)	22.6
Human capital impacts (qualifications gained)	1.8
Amenity benefits (improved public realm and green space)	0.9
Carbon emission savings (retrofitting)	0.6
Employment impact (jobs created)	0.0057
Direct land value uplift (construction activity)	*0.5*
Total NPV Benefits	26.4

The following wider benefits will also be delivered:

- An improved sense of belonging, and enhanced community resilience and cooperation
- Further physical and mental wellbeing improvements through engagement in outdoor activity and adopting healthier lifestyles, and learning and development benefits for children
- Public cost savings as a result of access to general support facilities
- Increased town centre footfall, dwell time and spend
- Improved perceptions of Barrow as a place to live by current residents and visitors.

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2025/26, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The project will be managed by Cumbria County Council, sponsor of the overall project and asset owner of the Bram Longstaff, Ormsgill and Earnse Bay sites, working in partnership with Barrow Borough Council, local planning authority and asset owner of The Forum (Town Centre Hub).

Key dependencies include:

- **Member approval at key milestones**. Local Elected Members from both authorities have been included in the project governance structure and are fully supportive of the scheme.
- **Existing uses of The Forum**. The Forum is currently used by a range of Barrow Borough Council services and to accommodate the use as a community hub there is a requirement for existing services to be relocated. Barrow Borough Council will provide the steer and direction relating to how the hub will interface with existing services as the project develops.
- **Planning permission**. Full planning approval will be required at Earnse Bay. Early dialogue with the planning authority has commenced and initial discussions are positive. Early dialogue has included consultation with CCC as highway authority and lead local flood authority and discussions have been positive with key issues addressed through RIBA 2 design.
- **Links to other projects**. Including Local Walking and Cycling infrastructure which will support required improvements in the Town Centre, making the Town Centre hub more accessible to a wider range of residents.

The Council's Capital Programmes Team will manage all design and capital works required to deliver the project. The Council's portfolio of capital projects is overseen by the Strategic Investment Group (SIG), which manages resources to ensure effective delivery of the portfolio and uses a 'gateway' approach to approve the development and delivery of projects at key stages. The Council's Area Manager for Barrow will act as the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) for the project.

The business case identifies the key project milestones.

Milestone	End Date
Governance Arrangements & design preparation	Town Centre Hub August 2020-June 2021
	Ormsgill Hub October 2020-April 2021
	Bram Longstaffe Hub October 2020-April 2021
	Earnse Bay August 2020-April 2021
Scheme Design	Town Centre Hub - September 2021-March 2022
	Ormsgill Hub *already undertaken*
	Bram Longstaffe Hub - June 2021-December 2021
	Earnse Bay - June 2021-July 2022
Planning Permission	Earnse Bay - March 2022-June 2022
Construction	Town Centre Hub - May 2022-February 2023
	Ormsgill Hub - June 2020-April 2021
	Bram Longstaffe Hub February 2022 - November 2022
	Earnse Bay September 2022 - October 2024
Scheme Opens	Town Centre Hub - March 2023
	Ormsgill Hub – May 2021
	Bram Longstaffe Hub - December 2022
	Earnse Bay - November 2024

Key risks to be managed by Cumbria County Council through the project delivery are:

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation
There is a risk that materials and labour may be unavailable due to the overheated construction market resulting in increased programme costs and possible programme delays.	4	4	Procurement strategy to consider options for ECI. Contingency added to programme and budget.
The designs for the community hubs do not meet local needs resulting in a reduction in potential usage and poor delivery of outcomes	2	5	Close liaison with stakeholders throughout all stages of the project to ensure that project designs are developed in collaboration with the community
Potential service providers may not find the site attractive or commercial viable to operate from the site.	2	5	Comprehensive soft market testing early in the programme to establish interest and demand for the facilities.
There is a risk that potential costs for the project rise caused by a number of 'unknowns' resulting in potential additional costs to the programme.	3	4	Ensure regular and up to date cost analysis and discuss alternative cheaper options to ensure project is delivered within scope and budget. Include appropriate level of contingency.
There is a risk that changes associated with Local Government Reform (LGR) will affect the agreed project governance and begin to influence the project, creating programme delay and possible cost increases.	4	5	Monitor the risk and ensure that any changes in governance are reflected as early as possible.
There is a risk that planning permission is not secured in a timely way. This could be caused by public / stakeholder objections and result in the delay to project delivery	2	4	Early engagement with planning authority. Early public consultation to understand public support for the scheme and any potential objections.

As the Forum is a Barrow Borough Council asset, Cumbria County Council will look to them to manage the ownership of the risks surrounding the Town Centre Hub. Key financial risks will be managed through contracts with the design consultant or principal contractor.

Cumbria County Council has a track record of delivering major schemes across a range of property, infrastructure and maintenance interventions. This provides reassurance of capability and capacity to deliver the project on time and to budget.

The Community Hubs and Earnse Bay will remain in the ownership of the existing organisations as summarised below and will be managed as follows:

- **Earnse Bay:** Cumbria County Council own the land and will enter a long term lease arrangement with Barrow Borough Council to manage and maintain the site
- **Bram Longstaffe**: Cumbria County Council own the site. Friends of Bram are the tenant and will be responsible for managing the site.
- **Town Centre Hub:** Barrow Borough Council own the Forum and manage all existing operations. Barrow Borough Council will be responsible for managing and maintaining the site following the capital improvement works.
- **Ormsgill:** Cumbria County Council own, manage and maintain the site.

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.
3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.
4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority:

Job title:

Name and signature:

Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Business & Enterprise Support
2. Heads of Terms project conditions - Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. - Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.
No conditions were attached to this project within the Heads of Terms.
3. Business case appraisal Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including: - business case type - any internal or external assurances
Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.
4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment
No capital funding is included in the programme for this project.
5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value) A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.

The value for money assessment identifies a 'very high' Benefit Cost Ratio achieved from the preferred option of 4.2:1.

Economic impacts, net of reference case	Preferred Option
Present value of costs (£m)	0.5
Present value of benefits (£m)	1.96
Benefit Cost Ratio	4.2

Optimism bias of 5% was used taking into account the robustness of benchmark information used to inform benefits. The net present value of costs was £0.5 million.

A net present value of benefits of £1.96 million was derived from GVA (associated with jobs created or safeguarded) and social value (associated with skills development, employment, and provision of business support to social enterprises).

The preferred option will also deliver wider benefits including:

- The development of new technologies, products, and processes through strand 3 as businesses access new opportunities in the BAE systems supply chain.
- Improved perceptions of Barrow as place to start and grow a business, particularly a community business/social enterprise.
- The development of collaborations between business, organisations and residents in the community.
- Positive impacts on social cohesion, civic participation and individual wellbeing.

Final outcomes secured through the project include:

- To assist residents, particularly from the most derived communities in Barrow, access good quality economic opportunities [by starting their own businesses, becoming self-employed or via the creation and growth of community businesses].
- To enable SMEs in Barrow to become more competitive, resilient, expand and recover from the effects of Covid-19.
- Creation of a strong on-the-ground presence to encourage enterprise in Barrow, working through the Community Wellbeing Hubs.
- Working with schools, Furness College and the University of Cumbria (including the proposed Barrow Learning Quarter development), the local community and voluntary sector to encourage greater levels of enterprise in Barrow.

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2025/26, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The project will be managed by Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership (CLEP) who are responsible for delivering the government's local growth hub activities. CLEP intends to procure specialist provision to deliver all four strands of activity which will be delivered under two separate contracts with suitably procured suppliers.

The main dependencies involved in delivering the project are as follows:

- Interest and take up in the tender specifications developed and released. Any risk to securing appropriate interest should be mitigated through the soft-market testing.
- Confirmation of a funding award from BEIS to CLEP for growth hub support, BEIS have indicated that as part of the LEP Review, this service will form a core part of LEP activity going forward.

- Ability of sub-contractors to successfully deliver the required outcomes. CLEP will reduce any risk to delivery through providing each sub-contractor with appropriate support as well as implementing robust contract management procedures. This will also be underpinned by targeted marketing to increase visibility of the schemes.

The business case identifies the key project milestones:

Milestone	Date
Soft market testing activities commence	15/11/2021
Soft market testing activities complete	15/12/2021
Development of tender specifications commence	1/1/2022
Consultation on tender specifications with Barrow BC	15/1/2022
Finalisation of tender specifications	31/1/2022
Tender specifications launched	1/2/2022
Closing date for tender specifications	20/2/2022
Appointment of sub-contractors	1/3/2022
Pre-launch meetings with sub-contractors commence	2/3/2022
Anticipated notification of BEIS growth hub funding award for 2022/23	15/3/2022
Targeted marketing campaign commences	25/3/2022
Service delivery commences	1/4/2022
Monthly sub-contractor reporting commences	15/5/2022
Quarterly progress and claim reports submitted to Barrow Borough Council (commencing)	15/7/2022
Project completion	30/9/2025

The key risks to be managed by CLEP through project delivery are:

Risk	Impact Score 1-5 (5= highest)	Likelihood Score 1-5 (5= highest)	Mitigation
Lack of interest in the tendered opportunities	5	2	• Soft market testing to be undertaken through Q3 2021/22
Lack of suitable compliant tenders	3	2	• Soft market testing to be undertaken through Q3 2021/22
Lack of local interest in the programmes available	3	2	• Careful selection of sub-contractors to ensure they have necessary experience and local infrastructure • Targeted marketing campaign.
Lack of integration with other business support	3	2	• Careful design of tender specifications • CLEP involvement in National Growth Hub Network to ensure

services/duplication with other offers			knowledge of new business support programmes • Regular dialogue with Business Strategy Group • Break clauses in contracts allow for redesign of activity if required
Poor delivery of contracted services	3	2	• Robust tender process should assess for quality and experience • Regular contract monitoring for both performance and quality • Contract control measures to ensure performance remains on track (including improvement plans) • Option to terminate contracts

Given the nature of the project, there are limited financial risks which can be managed through procurement and the Grant Funding Agreement. CLEP has an established track record of delivering business support which provides confidence in successful delivery.

A programme manager will be identified to lead delivery of the project and wider support will be provided through CLEP's Business & Programmes Team.

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.
3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.
4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority:

Job title:

Name and signature:

Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Housing Renewal Programme
2. Heads of Terms project conditions - Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. - Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.
No conditions were attached to this project within the Heads of Terms.
3. Business case appraisal Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including: - business case type - any internal or external assurances
Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.
4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment
The spend profile allocates £65,000 capital expenditure in 2021/22. This in part is to support business case development and is also directed towards the early stages of improvements to properties on Rawlinson Street. This activity will include mobilising the specialist consultants to review and verify the existing schedule of works and update the cost profile accordingly.
5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value) A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.
The value for money of the Housing renewal programme is considered 'high' with a Benefit Cost ratio (BCR) of 2.0.

Economic impacts, net of reference case	Option 7 (Preferred option)
Present value of costs (£m)	4.18
Present value of benefits (£m)	8.27
Benefit Cost Ratio	2.0

Optimism bias of 24% was used for the majority of capital costs (reduced for Rawlinson Street elements of the project, where scheme costs are further developed). After discounting the net present value of costs was £4.18 million.

A net present value of benefits of £8.27 million was derived from a range of benefit streams, as follows:

Benefits (£m)	**Preferred Option (net)**
Carbon emission savings	2.00
Public realm impact	0.11
Wellbeing impact / Direct land Value Uplift	3.29
Distributional impact	1.15
Wider Commercial Land Value Uplift	0.09
Health Benefits	1.63
Total NPV Benefits	8.27

The project benefits described above will deliver:

- CO_2 reduction of 367 tonnes per year in Barrow, through increasing the EPC rating of 295 homes
- Removal of up to 112 Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS) Category 1 Hazards with associated cost savings to the NHS
- Improved well-being for 295 affected households with associated impact on Land Values
- Energy cost saving to 295 households (IMD lowest decile for income deprivation)

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2024/25, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The project will be managed day to day by the identified lead officer in Barrow Borough Council, currently the Property Services Group Manager.

Project progress will be reported monthly to the Corporate Programme Board, consisting of the Council's Senior Management Team and including the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) for the project within the Council, which is the Director of People and Place.

The main dependencies in the programme relate to:

- **Design/costing work** – a pre-tender schedule of works will be required before the second stage of procurement. This has been allowed for in the project milestones
- **Planning permission** – consent will be required for some of the external works. This approval will be sought in early 2022 for Rawlinson Street and in late 2022 for the Ferry Road Triangle once survey work has been completed.

The business case identifies the key project milestones.

Milestone	Start	Completion
Refresh surveys and spec for Rawlinson St	1-Oct-21	30-Dec-21
Public engagement / Obtain property owners consents	1-Jan-22	1-Apr-22
Planning consents for Rawlinson St	1-Jan-22	1-Apr-22
Procurement of contractor for Rawlinson St	1-Jan-22	1-Apr-22
Start on site Rawlinson St	1-May-22	1-May-22
Work on site Rawlinson St	1-May-22	30-Oct-22
Procurement of professional services Ferry Road Triangle	1-Jul-22	30-Aug-22
Survey works and specification Ferry Rd Triangle	1-Sep-22	16-Oct-22
Ferry Rd Public engagement / Obtain property owners consents	1-Sep-22	15-Dec-22
Planning consents for Ferry Rd Triangle	20-Dec-22	18-Feb-23
Procurement of contractor for Ferry Rd Triangle	20-Oct-22	19-Dec-22
Start on site Ferry Rd Triangle	1-Mar-23	1-Mar-23
Work on site Ferry Rd Triangle	1-Mar-23	29-Feb-24
Rawlinson St defects and retentions	15-Sep-23	30-Oct-23
Ferry Rd defects and retentions	1-Jan-25	2-Mar-25

The key risks to be managed by Barrow Borough council through the project delivery are:

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation
Reputational risk of procurement of works over budget	4	2	Realistic business case and robust pre-tender estimates including contingency/headroom suggest budgets can be managed and benefits delivered. Effective communication of the process and of the fall back position of reducing the scope of the scheme.

Low take up of scheme	4	2	Effective liaison and engagement with property owners. This will require adequate staffing resource into the project but the Council's track record indicates high take-up is expected
Delays to programme	3	2	Effective programming and contractor managements
Failure to appoint main contractors	4	1	Mature and competitive market, the type of works required are fairly standard and numerous firms are available in this market
Failure to obtain planning consent	4	1	Early engagement with Planning Department
Failure to appoint consultants	4	1	Mature and competitive market means consultancy services are available

The key financial risks, around cost overruns can be managed through the contract to limit Barrow Borough Council's exposure to financial uncertainty, while maximising deliverable outputs for the available budget. The risk retained by the Council primarily relates to the extent to which benefits are realised if the scope of work is required to change to manage the budget.

The track record of barrow Borough Council in managing this type of scheme in line with their budget minimises the likelihood of this eventuality, however, sensitivity testing in the Economic Case suggests that the project would still delivery value for money even if outcomes fall short of the central estimate.

An project manager will be appointed to manage the contract with consultants and all other stakeholder engagement including property owners and (where applicable) their tenants.

The homes and commercial properties that receive improvement will not be owned or managed by Barrow Borough Council in the long run. The properties will only be improved in agreement with the current owners and occupiers.

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.
3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.

4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority:

Job title:

Name and signature:

Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Marina Village
2. Heads of Terms project conditions - Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. - Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.
The following project condition was included within the programme Heads of Terms letter dated 27th October 2020: **Assurances on deliverability and further information on private sector investment once remediation is complete.** In response to this condition, LSH were commissioned to provide an independent assessment of market conditions and interest. Their report ('Barrow Marina Village: Remediation Context & Marketing Report') was submitted to Government as part of the Heads of Terms response on 15th January 2021. The report concluded: 'The Marina Village site is a key development site within Barrow-in-Furness Town Centre, and presents an opportunity to enliven the waterfront, provide a new diverse housing offer and bringing a unique and perception changing development to the town. The market research undertaken by LSH has provided evidence that there is a demand for the housing to be provided at the Marina Village Site. But more importantly that there is clear interest from the private sector to bring forward the site for housing, from both local and regional developers'.
3. Business case appraisal Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including: - business case type - any internal or external assurances
Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.
4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment
The spend profile allocates £90,000 capital expenditure in 2021/22. This spend supports business case development and will also be directed towards professional fees in support of the land acquisition required to progress the development of Marina Village for housing.

5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value)

A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.

The value for money of the first phase of the Marina Village programme is considered 'Acceptable' on the basis of its monetised costs and benefits, with an initial Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 1.2.

Economic impacts, net of reference case	Initial BCR: land value uplift	Adjusted BCR: including temporary construction
Present value of net economic impact (£m)	3.3	3.9
Present Value of Town Deal Project Costs (£m)	2.7	2.7
Benefit Cost Ratio	1.2	1.4

Optimism Bias of 15% was applied to the capital costs. These were reduced from the upper bound 24% estimate on the basis of an existing programme of similar work taking place on the site. This allowed the programme team access to detailed studies and some existing tender prices for work on other parts of the site with Optimism Bias reduced accordingly.

A present value of £3.3 million was estimated for the phase of the programme most closely associated with the Town Fund project on the basis of associated direct and indirect land value uplift. This value is estimated net of the existing remediation projects on site at Marina Village and after accounting for displacement (15% direct LVU and 25% wider LVU). A further £0.64 million of local economic benefits were estimated from the construction activity associated with this phase of the project (net of deadweight (50%), displacement (50%) and leakage (25%).

Benefits	**Preferred Option (net, £m)**
Direct land value uplift	1.62
Wider and value uplift	1.68
Temporary construction	*0.64*
Total:	**3.94**

The project will deliver:

- acquisition of three plots (known locally as plots 7, 10 & 12) on the Marina Village site that remain outside of the Council's ownership to give full land title
- a detailed feasibility study on relocating the waste services depot that is currently blocking (subject to lease conditions around relocation) the redevelopment of a further 2.9 hectares of land on the site
- commission the professional services required to progress a planning application on the site e.g. ecological surveys and interventions

- clearance of vacant industrial buildings

The outcomes associated with the project include:

- improved access to further remediation funding, and
- consolidation of the whole of the Marina Village site (north of cavendish Dock Road) into Barrow Borough Council Control, leading to:
    - an expanded planning application boundary
    - the opportunity to market land suitable for 124 homes to developers

Wider benefits of the redevelopment of Marina Village include:

- remediation of contaminated land
- reduced crime and anti-social behaviour
- improved amenity value to residents with access to a waterfront nature reserve
- wider regeneration impact of new community close to the town centre

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2024/25, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The project will be managed day to day by the identified lead officer in Barrow Borough Council, currently the Property Services Group Manager. The project will report into the wider Marina Village Programme Board which is jointly attended by officers from Cumbria County Council and Barrow Borough Council.

The main dependencies in the project relate to:

- The core of the activity proposed for the Towns Fund project relates to land acquisition and consequently the key dependencies for the project relate to the timeline for acquisition. Although the objective is to achieve a negotiated sale of plots known locally as plots 7, 10 & 12, the current landowners have in the past expressed an unwillingness to sell at the market values estimated by the council's surveyors.
- In the worst case the council will be required to pursue a compulsory purchase order in which the land acquisition may take up to a further two years. Key dependencies in the process are:
    - The decision to confirm the CPO process by Barrow's Cabinet
    - If the CPO is contested the length of time to hold a public enquiry and receive a decision from the Secretary of State.

- This legal process is also the key constraint on acquisition, with the existing land owners able to contest the process should they choose to and believe this to be in their best interests. The final payment of compensation for the land is also dependent on whether the compensation amount is contested and the length of negotiations. This means the final compensation may realistically be paid in any of the financial years 2022/23, 2023/24 or 2024/25.
- Planning is not necessarily a constraint on the land acquisition but Barrow Borough Council intend to begin the planning application process as part of this project to continue removing constraints on development from the wider Marina Village site. With site ecology a potential constraint on site clearance and a desire to consolidate the planning application boundary this activity supports the wider strategic aim of preparing the site for remediation.
- The eventual relocation of the waste / recycling depot is also a dependent on the feasibility study identifying a suitable site. This stage of the redevelopment of Marina Village is out of scope for the Towns Fund project however and the feasibility is in that respect a mitigating action in support of the wider programme

The main milestones for the land acquisition are as follows:

Milestone	Negotiated sale	Uncontested CPO	Contested CPO
Negotiations with landowners continue	July – November 2021		
Negotiations fail to reach a conclusion		End of November 2021	
Submit report to cabinet to confirm CPO		End of January 2022	
Prepare documents for secretary of state and serve notices		Mid-April 2022	
Submit to secretary of state		End of April 2022	
Secretary of State decision			End November 2022
Council take possession and ownership of the property		End August 2022	End June 2023
Compensation negotiations fail			End of June 2023
Lands Tribunal Decision			End October 2023
Outstanding compensation paid		End August 2022	October 2023 – April 2024

The waste depot relocation study will be procured in 2021-22 and should complete by 2022.

The key partnership for the Marina Village programme is with the Cumbria County Council which is currently managing the first phase of remediation work on Marina Village.

The key risks associated with the project are:

Risk	**Mitigating Actions**
Lack of engagement from owners of plots 7, 10 and 12.	Build in sufficient time for an effective CPO process. At a minimum the CPO process is expected to take 18 months. The programme allows for significantly longer than this period.
Unrealistic expectations of value from owners of plots 7, 10 and 12.	Obtain robust valuations and allow sufficient time for the formal First Tier Tribunal process to be used.
CPO process fails	Ensure that appropriate advice is obtained and case for CPO is robust. This will include using Counsel advice if needed.
Waste depot relocation feasibility indicates lack of alternatives for depot site	Work with Eden and SLDC to put in place waste service and search for a new site for East Cumbria Council.
Cost overruns for clearance / demolition work	Mature and competitive market. Correct project management will escalate any risks in prices rising to the programme board. Legislation will be added to the contracts with partners.
Failure to appoint main contractors	Currently a very competitive market in the area. Initial soft testing with the market could be undertaken.
Failure to gain updated planning permission	Work closely with Barrow Borough Council Planning Department. The proposed planning boundary will remain in line with the planning policy of the area.

Asset ownership and management

The intention of the project is a) to bring third-party land assets currently into Barrow Borough Council ownership and b) to take control of Barrow Borough Council owned assets by removing constraints in current land uses to make the whole site suitable for remediation and subsequently redevelopment. The final outcome of the project will involve gradually disposing of the site to the private sector as remediation work allows.

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.
3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.
4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority:

Job title:

Name and signature:

Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Place Development
2. Heads of Terms project conditions – Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. – Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.

The following project condition was included within the programme Heads of Terms letter dated 27th October 2020:

Conversation required on alignment with the Towns Fund Intervention Framework.

Following constructive conversations with Government, the scope of project activities was revised to focus on capital 'events infrastructure' which seeks to remove key barriers to the successful delivery of cultural and heritage related activity within Barrow, while retaining a supporting revenue element (c20% in terms of Towns Fund contribution) to facilitate project management and place promotion activities.

The project will directly deliver the Town Deal outputs of new, upgraded or protected arts, culture and heritage capital investment, and maximise the success of these aligned investments through place promotion activity to realise the outcomes of perceptions of the place by residents/visitors and increase the number of visitors to arts, cultural and heritage events and venues.

Intervention Framework	Output Indicators	Outcome Indicators
Arts, Culture and Heritage	New, upgraded or protected community centres, sports or athletics facilities, museums, arts venues, theatres, libraries, film facilities, prominent landmarks or historical buildings, parks or gardens	Perceptions of the place by residents/visitors
		Number of visitors to arts, cultural and heritage events and venues
		Other: Social Return on Investment

Source: Towns Fund Guidance, Annex A Intervention Framework

These details were confirmed to Government as part of the Heads of Terms response on 15th January 2021.

3. Business case appraisal

Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including:

- business case type
- any internal or external assurances

Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.

4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment

The spend profile allocates £9,000 of Towns Fund towards capital spend in 2021/22 (from a total annual spend of £19,000). This spend supports business case development including design and costings.

5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value)

A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.

The value for money assessment identifies a 'high' Benefit Cost Ratio achieved from the preferred option of 2.1:1.

Economic impacts, net of reference case	Preferred Option
Present value of costs (£m)	0.9
Present value of benefits (£m)	2.0
Benefit Cost Ratio	2.1

Optimism bias of 15% has been applied to total costs reflecting that capital works are limited to temporary structures rather than a building; the duration of public realm improvements will be relatively short; detailed costs provided; and strong track record of delivery. After discounting, the net present value of costs was £0.9m.

A net present value of benefits of £2m was derived from a range of benefit streams, as follows:

Benefits (£m)	**Preferred Option (net)**
Social impact of increased well being as a result of arts and cultural engagement	1.7
Amenity benefits (improved public realm)	0.2
Wider land value uplift (due to additional footfall, dwell time and spend)	0.08
Total NPV Benefits	2.0

The following wider benefits will also be delivered:

- Additional charity donations
- Greater visibility of initiatives and events which will aim to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour among young people
- Human capital and skills gained by volunteers and participants through participation in events and activities
- Increasing the sense of pride and belonging for residents
- Promoting inward investment into Barrow by improving perceptions of the attractiveness of Barrow
- A more coordinated approach to the visitor and tourism sector in Barrow
- Diversifying the local economy (increased number of jobs in visitor, accommodation, retail and leisure sectors)
- Developing the tourism sector in Barrow which would attract and retain residents and visitors to the area
- Improved perceptions of Barrow as a place to live by current residents and visitors.

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2025/26, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The project will be managed by Barrow Borough Council who will work with external partners including Barra Culture, Barrow BID and Cando FM. All assets will be managed and owned by Barrow Borough Council. Maintenance of the public realm investment will be undertaken by the Council's property services department.

Key dependencies for the delivery of capital works include:

- **Obtaining relevant planning consent** - Early pre application engagement with the planning authority (Barrow BC), and other stakeholders will ensure that designs are developed in a form that is most likely to secure consent. Wider stakeholder engagement activities and taking on board the views of local businesses, market traders and residents will increase the likelihood of consents being obtained in a timely manner.
- **Land Ownership/Control** - The sites (land) for both areas of intervention is within the Council's control which de risks the scheme, either freehold or long term lease which is being renegotiated to freehold title.
- **Survey work** – pre commencement surveys may be required such as test pits and ground investigations at the Amphitheatre site, these will need to be undertaken in a timely manner to reduce delay to the programme. As landowner the Council already holds topographical and technical amenities data in relation to the sites.

The business case identifies the key project milestones:

Stage	Milestone Description	Target End Date
Initiation	Business Case developed and submitted for assurance	August 2021
Delivery	Recruitment of Project Officer	April 2022
Delivery	Footfall Counters installed	April 2022
Delivery	Tender for Feasibility Study	June 2022
Design	Public realm works design options completed	July 2022
Delivery	Commission Feasibility Study	August 2022
Design	Consultation on Public realm Projects	August 2022
Design	RIBA 3 designs of public realm completed	September 2022
Design	Submission of Planning Application	September 2022
Design	Planning Permission received	December 2022
Delivery	Tender for capital works	December 2022
Delivery	Undertake any necessary survey and pre commencement assessments	January 2023
Delivery	Let contract for capital works	January 2023
Delivery	Public realm works commence on site	February 2023
Delivery	Completion of Feasibility Study	March 2023
Delivery	Events Programmed for season 23/24	April 2023
Delivery	Completion of Capital works	May 2023
Delivery	Launch of Events Spaces	Summer 2023
Delivery	Marketing of events and facilities	Ongoing

Delivery	Monitoring events and activities	Ongoing
Delivery	Events Programmed for season 24/25	January 2024
Delivery	Events Programmed for season 25/26	January 2025
Closure	Evaluation and Feedback of Project	December 2025

The key risks to be managed by Barrow Borough Council through project delivery are:

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation
Poor definition of the scope of the project	4	4	Meetings held to further develop the scope so that it can be fully costed. Require the costing of individual elements of events so that scope can be pulled if not viable.
Suitable personnel not identified/available to fill key project roles	4	4	Consider recruiting an external lead for specific larger events - advertise this as widely as possible. Expand recruitment channels.
Insufficient resource for promoting and advertising of events	4	3	Work on securing a lead for advertising and promoting. Assess the viability of this and whether it can be funded.
Extended restrictions/social distancing due to rising cases of COVID-19 creating barriers to planning/running of events.	3	4	Consider introducing vaccine passports/lateral flow testing for events. Ensure contingency plans in place for an alternative way of delivering the events if problems surrounding COVID-19 restrictions arise.
Extended restrictions/social distancing due to rising cases of	2	4	Discussions around alternate ways of communication i.e., zoom,

COVID-19 leading to ineffective stakeholder engagement			surveys, social media videos.
Lack of communication with other partners in the local area resulting in duplication of events	4	2	Communication with partners to be aware of events. Continuous research into proposals for new events in advance. Be cautious about dates set for repeated annual events i.e., Dickensian, Croft Rock, Chilli Festival. Development and communication of the events team. Attend meetings where discussions around what events are happening take place - internal and external.

Barrow Borough Council have a strong track record of delivering projects of this type which provides confidence in delivery.

The procurement and management of the project will be the responsibility of the Senior Responsible Officer at Barrow Borough Council. The day-to-day management of the project will be undertaken by the newly recruited Place Development Officer.

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.
3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.

4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority:

Job title:

Name and signature:

Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 1: Project Summary Document

Summary Document table
1. Project name: Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure
2. Heads of Terms project conditions - Actions taken to address any conditions attached to the project in the Heads of Terms, where applicable. - Where the condition was to provide a delivery plan please input in the section below (no.9) and/or attach to this document.
No conditions were attached to this project within the Heads of Terms.
3. Business case appraisal Provide details of how the business case has been appraised including: - business case type - any internal or external assurances
Following the Town Deal Board meeting on 22nd October, this section will be completed to provide the conclusions from the business case assurance process, which are being presented to the Board for consideration.
4. MHCLG capital (CDEL) 5% payment
The spend profile allocates £140,000 capital expenditure in 2021/22. This spend supports business case development including technical design and costings.
5. Quantified benefit-cost ratio/value for money (e.g. Benefit Cost Ratio or Net Present Social Value) A quantified benefit-cost ratio should be provided. If it has not been generated, a summary of evidence used by the S151 Officer to demonstrate value for money should be stated.
The value for money assessment identifies a 'very high' Benefit Cost Ratio achieved from the preferred package of 8.36:1.

Economic impacts, net of reference case	Preferred Package (2010 values)	Preferred Package (2021 values)
Present value of costs (£m)	2.849	4.190
Present value of benefits (£m)	23.806	35.009
Benefit Cost Ratio	8.36	8.36

Optimism bias of 15% was used in line with the AMAT tool assumption reflecting the current status of cost estimates. Monetised costs are discounted to provide net present values and reported in 2010 values (in line with TAG and using DfT's current base year for appraisal). A net present value of benefits was derived from a range of benefit

streams in the AMAT tool including health, journey quality and mode shift. For comparison, 2021 values are also presented.

The preferred option will also deliver wider benefits such as:

- road safety improvements at specific junctions not captured by the AMAT's route focused assessment methodology;
- potential for associated public realm improvements;
- potential for associated Land Value Uplift; and
- greater levels of educational attainment and higher skills due to enhanced connections between residents and education / training / work placements.

Final outcomes secured through the project include:

- The percentage of people commuting by cycling in Barrow would increase from levels circa 4-8% to 10 -14% with scope for some wards to see growth to between 25-29%.
- An increase in cycling on each proposed corridor equivalent to:
    - Abbey Road: 27%
    - Walney Road: 38%; and
    - Roose Road: 67%.
- An increase in health and wellbeing in connected areas where motorised traffic levels are reduced.

6. Deliverability

Will this project still be delivered within the Towns Fund timeframe? (Y/N)

The project will be completed in 2024/25, within the Towns Fund timeframe.

7. Delivery plan

Including details of:

- timescales and key milestones
- partnerships
- interdependencies
- risks and mitigation measures (if not provided above).

The project will be managed by Cumbria County Council, as the highway authority responsible for the delivery of the project. The Council's Capital Programmes Team will manage all design and capital works required to deliver the project.

The Council's portfolio of capital projects is overseen by the Strategic Investment Group (SIG), which manages resources to ensure effective delivery of the portfolio and uses a 'gateway' approach to approve the development and delivery of projects at key stages.

As all schemes are on the local highway network, it is not anticipated any partnerships with other organisations will be required for project delivery.

Key dependencies include:

- **Member approval at key milestones**. Local Elected Members from both authorities have been included in the project governance structure and are fully supportive of the scheme.
- **Links to other projects**. Investment from DfT's Active Travel Fund will complement the Town Deal investment and is identified as Phase 1 in the Barrow LCWIP Draft Priority Cycle Network. The Town Deal investment constitutes Phase 2. Subject to securing funding, further phases will be delivered in line with the LCWIP.

The business case identifies the key project milestones:

Stage	Milestone Description	Completion
Procurement	Prepare tender	28/01/22
	Tender response period	28/02/22
	Assess tenders	18/03/22
	Appoint	30/03/22
Design	Concept design - review, clarification	13/04/22
	Statutory Undertakers: C2 – C4 consultation	25/08/22
	Review topo surveys	25/04/22
	Intrusive surveys and other new surveys	30/05/22
	Site visit	19/04/22
	Design models and work	26/12/22
	Road Safety Audit	10/11/22
	Consultation 1 and 2	28/02/23
	TRO application	29/04/23
	Design revision	29/07/23
	Finalise construction information	30/08/23
Construction	Management and prelims	15/08/24
	Traffic management	15/08/24
	Construction	15/08/24

The key risks to be managed by Cumbria County Council through project delivery are:

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigation
Insufficient funding allocated for programme to achieve critical mass	4	3	Bid pitched at a realistic level with contingency plans for scaled back programme

Lack of stakeholder support for changes to the highway network (capacity, safety)	4	2	Early and effective communication with key stakeholders when programme starts. Inclusion of Cumbria Highways in project management group
Lack of public support for changes to highway network (capacity, safety)	3	2	Early and effective public consultation / engagement when programme starts.
Cost increases following disruption due to COVID	4	3	Effective competitive tendering
Withdrawal of funding during programme	4	2	Contingencies for scaling back programme
Insufficient funding allocated for programme to achieve critical mass	4	3	Bid pitched at a realistic level with contingency plans for scaled back programme

The key financial risks will be managed through the design and build contract with a procured contractor. As detailed design work is completed, more certainty will be available on the cost of the scheme, thus reducing the risk of any overspend.

Cumbria County Council has a strong track record in the delivery of highway schemes that provides reassurance that the project can be delivered on time and within budget.

Cumbria County Council as local highway authority will own and manage any assets built as part of the project. Assets will be included as part of the adopted highway network and managed in accordance with the Councils Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP).

8. Town Deal Board Chair name & signature

Name of the Town Deal Board:

Chair's name and signature:

Date:

9. By signing, I agree that:

1. The business case, in a proportionate manner, is Green Book compliant.
2. The 5% early capital (CDEL) has been included in the Town Fund project costs across the programme.

3. This project and expenditure represent value for money, including the 5% early capital (CDEL) provided.
4. Project-level Equality Impact Assessments such as Public Sector Equalities Duty and/or Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken.
5. For final submission - programme-level Public Sector Equality Duty assessment has been undertaken by the accountable body.

Name of the lead Local Authority and signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer

Name of the lead Local Authority:

Job title:

Name and signature:

Date:

Towns Fund Summary Document

Part 2: Town Investment Plan (TIP) conditions

Towns are **only** required to submit this with the **first batch** of Summary Document if any TIP conditions are listed in the Heads of Terms. All TIP conditions must be met **before funding can be released.**

TIP conditions table
1. TIP improvement condition Set out TIP improvement conditions as agreed in Heads of Terms
The following TIP Improvement conditions were set out in the Heads of Terms letter dated 27th October 2020: 1. Barrow should conduct project assurance in line with agreed routes for each individual project 2. Barrow should provide a plan for continued and varied private sector engagement.
2. Evidence Provide evidence of how conditions have been addressed
Documents have previously been provided to Government to address both conditions and are appended again for reference. **Project Assurance** The 21st May 2021 meeting of the Town Deal Board endorsed the draft Local Assurance Framework, which was subsequently approved at the June meeting of the Accountable Body's Executive Committee and submitted to Government on 30th June 2021. The LAF sets out the process which has been used for local project assurance. A copy of the Local Assurance Framework is provided at **Appendix A**(See Note 1) **Private Sector Engagement** A Private Sector Engagement Plan, building on details provided in the Town Investment Plan, was produced in December 2020 and submitted to Government, as part of the initial response to Heads of Terms, on 15th January 2021. The Plan has continued to guide activities during project and business case development, overseen by the Brilliant Barrow Communications & Engagement Group. A copy of the Private Sector Engagement Plan is provided at **Appendix B**(See Note 1)

3. Name of the Town Deal Board Chair & signature
Name of the Town Deal Board: Chair's name and signature: Date:
4. Lead Local Authority's name & signature of the Chief Executive Officer or S151 Officer.
Name of the lead Local Authority: Job title: Name and signature: Date:

[1]Town Deal Board Meeting Papers 22nd October 2021: Copies of the Local Assurance Framework and Private Sector Engagement Plan have not been provided to accompany the draft Part 2 Summary, as these are unchanged from those previously shared with the Board.

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Annex A-1: detailed Towns Fund financial information

Note with this document:

We are asking towns to update their Annex A1 financial profile where this has changed since the original submission to MHCLG. Towns submitting their first Annex A1s for the 5th October deadline should also use this template. Profiles will be reviewed and approved subject to MHCLG's sign off processes. MHCLG will subsequently need to review and be satisfied with Summary Documents submitted after this process before funding can be released.
For first Annex A1 submissions, financial information will be used to for the Grant Offer Letter which will be issued subject to the Project Confirmation process. MHCLG will not hold any responsibility for inaccurate information in the Grant Offer Letter. For towns submitting a revised financial profile, this will not trigger a revised Grant Offer Letter. MHCLG continues to support its offer as stated in Heads of Terms (which also states the conditions). Funding from 2-22/23 onwards will be subject to the outcome of the Spending Review.

Summary:

Project	RDEL/CDEL	20/21(£)	21/22 (£)	22/23 (£)	23/24 (£)	24/25 (£)	25/26 (£)	Total (£)	Notes
Barrow Learning Quarter	RDEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	CDEL	0	296,667	6,365,000	3,497,000	187,000	21,000	10,366,667	
	Total	**0**	**296,667**	**6,365,000**	**3,497,000**	**187,000**	**21,000**	**10,366,667**	
Community Wellbeing Hubs & Earnse Bay Outdoor Centre	RDEL	0	0	56,000	150,000	100,000	94,000	400,000	
	CDEL	0	195,000	624,867	2,094,100	952,700	0	3,866,667	
	Total	**0**	**195,000**	**680,867**	**2,244,100**	**1,052,700**	**94,000**	**4,266,667**	
Business & Enterprise Support	RDEL	0	10,000	138,084	138,083	138,083	75,750	500,000	
	CDEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	**0**	**10,000**	**138,084**	**138,083**	**138,083**	**75,750**	**500,000**	
Housing Renewal Programme	RDEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	CDEL	0	65,000	1,011,250	2,037,917	502,500	0	3,616,667	
	Total	**0**	**65,000**	**1,011,250**	**2,037,917**	**502,500**	**0**	**3,616,667**	
Brilliant Barrow Place Development	RDEL	0	0	54,140	39,140	38,640	38,080	170,000	
	CDEL	0	9,000	311,000	324,167	2,500	0	646,667	
	Total	**0**	**9,000**	**365,140**	**363,307**	**41,140**	**38,080**	**816,667**	
Marina Village	RDEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	CDEL	0	90,000	177,000	477,000	222,667	0	966,667	
	Total	**0**	**90,000**	**177,000**	**477,000**	**222,667**	**0**	**966,667**	
Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure	RDEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	CDEL	0	140,000	1,000,000	1,826,667	1,000,000	0	3,966,667	
	Total	**0**	**140,000**	**1,000,000**	**1,826,667**	**1,000,000**	**0**	**3,966,667**	
Programme Management	RDEL	0	0	125,000	125,000	125,000	124,998	499,998	
	CDEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	**0**	**0**	**125,000**	**125,000**	**125,000**	**124,998**	**499,998**	
	RDEL total	**0**	**10,000**	**373,224**	**452,223**	**401,723**	**332,828**	**1,569,998**	
	CDEL total	**0**	**795,667**	**9,489,117**	**10,256,851**	**2,867,367**	**21,000**	**23,430,002**	
	Total	**0**	**805,667**	**9,862,341**	**10,709,074**	**3,269,090**	**353,828**	**25,000,000**	

CDEL 5% Early Drawdown Breakdown - FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

	20/21(£)	21/22 (£)	22/23 (£)	23/24 (£)	24/25 (£)	25/26 (£)	Total (£)	Notes
CDEL Total 21/22 Project Spend		795,667					795,667	
CDEL 5% prepayment + other payments							0	
Balance of Funding Owed							**0**	

Revenue (RDEL) split

	20/21(£)	21/22 (£)	22/23 (£)	23/24 (£)	24/25 (£)	25/26 (£)	Total (£)	Notes
Programme management RDEL	0	0	125,000	125,000	125,000	124,998	499,998	
Revenue funded projects	0	10,000	248,224	327,223	276,723	207,830	1,070,000	
Total RDEL	**0**	**10,000**	**373,224**	**452,223**	**401,723**	**332,828**	**1,569,998**	

Check against summary	**ok**	**ok**	**ok**	**ok**	**ok**	**ok**	**ok**

Check if Prog Mgmt RDEL < 5% overall	**ok**

Check if RDEL < 7% overall	**ok**

Summary Tables - autopopulates

1. Overall Budget by FY

Total budget	20/21(£)	21/22 (£)	22/23 (£)	23/24 (£)	24/25 (£)	25/26 (£)	Total (£)	Notes
	0	805,667	9,862,341	10,709,074	3,269,090	353,828	25,000,000	

2. Project totals

Project	Total (£)
Barrow Learning Quarter	10,366,667
Community Wellbeing Hubs & Earnse Bay Outdoor Centre	4,266,667
Business & Enterprise Support	500,000
Housing Renewal Programme	3,616,667
Brilliant Barrow Place Development	816,667
Marina Village	966,667
Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure	3,966,667
Programme Management	499,998
Total	**25,000,000**

3. RDEL/CDEL profile

RDEL/CDEL	20/21(£)	21/22 (£)	22/23 (£)	23/24 (£)	24/25 (£)	25/26 (£)	Total (£)	Notes
RDEL	0	10,000	373,224	452,223	401,723	332,828	1,569,998	
CDEL	0	795,667	9,489,117	10,256,851	2,867,367	21,000	23,430,002	

Towns Fund Delivery Partner

Projects

Indicator information

*** highlights indicators that also need to be included when filling in the project specific tabs**

MANDATORY INDICATORS	Unit of measurement:	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in reporting data for this indicator per project (please select):	Please flag any issues:
£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	£	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
£ co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public)*	£	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
£ co-funding committed (private and public)*	£	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
% of projects starting on time according to contract	%	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	Number	Every 6 months	Yes	Included where relevant - not all projects involve the employment of temporary staff. External contractors, consultants and existing staff assigned to work on project delivery are excluded from this count.
# of projects successfully completed	Number	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
% of projects completed within budget	%	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
% of projects completed on time	%	Every 6 months	Yes	No issues.
# of staff in regeneration team in council	Number	Every 12 months	Yes	Please note this is not a direct measure of Town Deal delivery capacity, as not all projects are delivered by the Accountable Body. Regeneration staff from other local authorities working to support Barrow Town Deal delivery are excluded from this count. Where the Accountable Body directly employs new staff to support project delivery, these staff will be reported as 'Temporary FTE jobs supported' and are excluded from this count.
£ budgeted for economic development team and functions	£	Every 12 months	Yes	Baseline to be agreed with Government, assumed to be budget for 2022/23. Please note this is not a direct measure of Town Deal delivery capacity, as not all projects are delivered by the Accountable Body.
Towns Self-Assessment Questions *(**TD Only**)*	Scores of 1 to 5	Every 12 months	N/A	*Further guidance will accompany the reporting template.*
# of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs **created** through the projects*	Number of FTE jobs	Every 12 months	Yes	Included where relevant - not all projects involve direct job creation.
# of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs **safeguarded** through the projects*	Number of FTE jobs	Every 12 months	Yes	Included where relevant - not all projects involve direct job creation.
Year on Year monthly % change in footfall	%	Every 12 months	Yes	This data will be collected through the Brilliant Barrow Place Development project.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Barrow Learning Quarter
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£10,366,667
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£6,520,333
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£16,887,000

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	10,366,667	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
	£ co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public)*	N/A	6,520,333	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero. Final figure to be confirmed following assurance.
	£ co-funding committed (private and public)*	N/A	6,520,333	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero. Final figure to be confirmed following assurance.
	# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	N/A	50	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Output from FBC relates to construction jobs and states c50 per year, but Annex 1 guidance requires unique jobs figure i.e. no count of same individuals over multiple years. Have used 50 as total figure - to be confirmed following assurance.
	# of learners/trainees/students enrolled at improved education and training facilities	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	1,000	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	# of learners/trainees/students enrolled at new education and training facilities	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	345	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	# of learners enrolled in new education and training courses	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	400	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	Amount of capacity of new or improved training or education facilities	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	1,200	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Number of closer collaborations with employers	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	1	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	# of learners/students/trainees gaining certificates, graduating or completing courses at new or improved training or education facilities, or attending new courses	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	1,350	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Non-standard Indicator: New Skills Facilities	N/A	2	N/A	Number	No	N/A	External	University of Cumbria	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1). Relates to new facilities provided at University Campus and Furness College sites.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Community Wellbeing Hubs & Earnse Bay Outdoor Centre
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£3,866,667
	Fund revenue amount:	£400,000
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£4,266,667

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	4,266,667	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero. Although Cumbria County Council is a Local Authority, it is considered 'external' in this context.
	# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	N/A	See Note	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Relates to construction jobs and FBC states that the total will be determined through procurement of capital works. **If posisble, an estimate will be provided using established metrics for construction projects, prior to final submission of the M&E Plan.**
	# of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs **created** through the projects*	N/A	7.5	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	Number of improved community/sports centres	Urban Regeneration	2	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Number of new community/sports centres	Urban Regeneration	2	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Number of trees planted	Urban Regeneration	500	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Amount of public realm improved	Urban Regeneration	700	N/A	m2	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Amount of existing parks/greenspace/outdoor improved	Urban Regeneration	32,500	N/A	m2	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Amount of new office space	Urban Regeneration	10	N/A	m2	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Estimated carbon dioxide equivalent reductions as a result of support	Urban Regeneration	1.27	N/A	Tonnes	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	Non-standard Indicator: Learners gaining basic qualifications	N/A	265	N/A	Number	No	N/A	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).
	Non-standard Indicator: Reduction in people who are digitally excluded	N/A	500	N/A	Number	No	N/A	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).
	Non-standard Indicator: People volunteering	N/A	28	N/A	Number	No	N/A	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Business & Enterprise Support
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£0
	Fund revenue amount:	£500,000
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£500,000

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	500,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnershio	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
	# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	N/A	0.7	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnershio	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	# of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs **created** through the projects*	N/A	189	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	# of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	218	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Note this comprises 120 'base' and 98 'intensive' assists.
	# of potential entrepreneurs assisted to be enterprise ready	Skills and Enterprise Infrastructure	323	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Note this comprises 134 'base' and 189 'intensive' assists.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Housing Renewal Programme
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£3,616,667
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£850,000
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£4,466,667

Indicator information

INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	3,616,667	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
£ co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public)*	N/A	850,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
£ co-funding committed (private and public)*	N/A	850,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	N/A	1	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
# of residential units improved/refurbished	Urban Regeneration	295	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	Yes	No Issues.
Number of residential units with green retrofits completed	Urban Regeneration	295	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	Yes	Please note it is assumed that the reference in guidance to 'new' properties within the wording of this indicator is an error. All residential properties improved will receive some form of retrofitted measures to aid energy efficiency. **Confirmation from MHCLG is required to ensure this assumption is correct.**
Estimated carbon dioxide equivalent reductions as a result of support	Urban Regeneration	367	N/A	Tonnes	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Agreed project methodology is comparison of sample of property EPC certificates before and after works.
Non-standard Indicator: Number of commercial properties improved	N/A	39	N/A	Number	No	N/A	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1). Relates to commercial properties receiving general improvement works to enhance streetscape and does not include any element of green retrofit.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
Project financing	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Marina Village
	Fund capital amount:	£966,667
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£966,667

Indicator information	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	**Intervention theme:**	**Target:**	**(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):**	**Unit of measurement:**	**Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:**	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	**Responsible for collecting (please select):**	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	**Frequency of reporting (please select):**	**Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):**	**Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)**	**If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:**
	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	966,667	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
	Non-standard Indicator: Number of sites acquired	N/A	3	N/A	Number	No	N/A	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Brilliant Barrow Place Development
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£646,667
	Fund revenue amount:	£170,000
	Co funding public:	£60,000
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£876,667

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	816,667	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
	£ co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public)*	N/A	60,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
	£ co-funding committed (private and public)*	N/A	60,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.
	# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	N/A	1	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1.
	Number of new cultural facilities	Urban Regeneration	2	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Amount of public realm improved	Urban Regeneration	1,230	N/A	m2	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Year on Year monthly % change in footfall	Urban Regeneration	6	N/A	%	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Data will be gathered from existing footfall counters and additional counters installed as part of the project.
	Non-standard Indicator: Resident visitors to arts, cultural and heritage sites across Barrow	N/A	42,200	N/A	Number	No	N/A	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1). Monitoring methodology to be confirmed following assurance.
	Non-standard Indicator: Residents/visitors with better place perceptions	N/A	51,600	N/A	Number	No	N/A	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1). Monitoring methodology to be confirmed following assurance.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal
	Name of Project:	Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£3,966,667
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£3,966,667

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is "Yes" please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	3,966,667	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero. Although Cumbria County Council is a Local Authority, it is considered 'external' in this context.
	# of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation*	N/A	24	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Relates to construction jobs.
	Total length of new cycle ways	Transport	4.8	N/A	Km	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Total length of pedestrian paths improved	Transport	3.25	N/A	Km	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	Yes	No issues.
	Automatic / manual counts of pedestrians and cyclists	Transport	See Note	N/A	Number	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline to be established on installation of counters prior to completion of works. **As set out in guidance, data and evidence requirements to be agreed with MHCLG following submission of M&E Plan.**
	Estimated carbon dioxide equivalent reductions as a result of support	Transport	See Note	N/A	Tonnes	Yes	Agree	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline and target based on pedestrian and cyclist count data - **methodology to be agreed with MHCLG following submission of M&E Plan.**
	Non-standard Indicator: Strategic cycle routes created	N/A	3	N/A	Number	No	N/A	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).
	Non-standard Indicator: Additional cycle trips per year (% uplift)	N/A	36	N/A	%	No	N/A	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).
	Non-standard Indicator: Additional walking trips per year (% uplift)	N/A	10	N/A	%	No	N/A	External	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Annually	Yes	N/A	Non-standard indicator (i.e. not specified in Annex 1).
END	*END*	*END*	*END*											

Towns Fund — Delivery Partner

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal Accelerated Funding
	Name of Project:	Site development works that will support the regeneration of the waterfront and enhance the gateway access to a new vibrant neighbourhood of 550 homes as part of the Town Investment Plan
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£50,000
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£50,000

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	50,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund Delivery Partner

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
Project financing	Programme (please select):	Town Deal Accelerated Funding
	Name of Project:	Revitalise and repurpose key spaces in the town centre through a programme of acquisition and creation of a youth based community hub. Plus, investment in outdoor event infrastructure and under used green spaces to encourage footfall in town centres and support Covid-19 recovery.
	Fund capital amount:	£651,000
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£651,000

Indicator information	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	651,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund

Projects

	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Programme (please select):	Town Deal Accelerated Funding
	Name of Project:	Tackle health inequalities and enhance Barrow's outdoor activity offer through investment into new outdoor exercise facilities at Barrow Park and Vickerstown.
Project financing	Fund capital amount:	£49,000
	Fund revenue amount:	£0
	Co funding public:	£0
	Co funding private:	£0
	Total value of project:	£49,000

	INDICATORS (replace text from E12 onwards with chosen project indicator)	Intervention theme:	Target:	(Future High Street Fund Only) Where can this target be found in your Business Case (please specify at least to page number):	Unit of measurement:	Is this an indicator from Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:	*If previous answer is 'Yes' please confirm you agree to the indicator definition and evidence requirements as stated in Annex 1 of the M&E Guidance:*	Responsible for collecting (please select):	*If previous answer is 'external' please provide name of organisation:*	*If 'external' please state whether agreement is in place:*	Frequency of reporting (please select):	Please confirm you are confident in collecting data for this indicator (please select):	Please confirm you are able to collect the baseline evidence as set out in Annex 1, if required (please select)	If answered 'No' to any questions, please flag the issues here:
Indicator information	£ spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners)*	N/A	49,000	N/A	£	Yes	Agree	Local authority	N/A	N/A	Every 6 months	Yes	N/A	No baseline evidence requirement set out in Annex 1. Baseline is Zero.

END *END* *END* *END*

Towns Fund Delivery Partner

Questions

		QUESTION	RESPONSE
		Are you planning on undertaking a local evaluation? If so, please provide an outline of what you would like to learn from it:	Local evaluation activities will be driven by interim and/or final evaluation activities at a project-level, where this is an agreed activity within project business cases, to be undertaken through the relevant project delivery organisations. The Brilliant Barrow Town Deal Board and the Local Accountable Body will oversee the evaluation process and provide input where appropriate. In addition, we would welcome further discussion with MHCLG on how we can assist and provide input into any wider evaluation activities led by Government.
		Please provide a brief outline on how you plan to communicate your results at the local level:	The Brilliant Barrow Communications & Engagement Group sits under the Brilliant Barrow Town Deal Board. The group co-ordinates the community engagement which has underpinned development of Barrow's Town Investment Plan and the projects within the plan, through channels including the Brilliant Barrow website, social media platforms and targeted communications. This work continues and going forward will include the ongoing communication of progress in delivery of the Town Investment Plan, key milestones and project achievements. These channels will also enable participation of the community in any project-level or other evaluation activities and communication of the outcomes.
		Please provide an overview to how you are resourcing your M&E reporting:	Each project delivery organisation is providing the necessary resources to undertake M&E at project level and these arrangements are reflected within project business cases. At programme level, the Accountable Body leads the M&E process and appropriate resource has been allocated within the Towns Fund Programme Management budget. The Accountable Body is supported through a Programme Management Office (PMO) function, provided through Cumbria County Council's Economic Programmes Team. The PMO functions include the receipt, verification and onward reporting of M&E data to the Brilliant Barrow Town Deal Board and to Government.
		Is there anything else you would like to add, or provide further information on?	Not at this stage. The M&E Plan is considered to be a 'live' document and will continue to be refined prior to the commencement of project delivery, then reviewed regularly thereafter. Further information can be provided on request and any clarifications required will be raised with MHCLG as they arise.
END	*END*	*END*	*END*