

## Project re-prioritisation options

1. At the Board meeting on 16 July, the Board has approved the two-phased project re-prioritisation approach, as set out in the Parameters paper:
  - 1.1 Phase 1: agreed parameters – approved projects should not lead to increased risk (financial; delivery and reputational) for the accountable body (Redditch BC); top slicing should be avoided; additional third party contributions / other sources of funding should not be taken into account unless approved in writing prior to the Board meeting on 13 August. The fourth ‘scale back’ parameter had been incorporated in the re-prioritisation tool already.
  - 1.2 Phase 2: use of the Towns Fund Delivery Partner’s project re-prioritisation tool to select the projects to be taken forward for delivery.
2. Following the Board meeting on 16 July, all project promoters were asked to complete the re-prioritisation tool, which resulted in the following ranking (Table 1). The completed re-prioritisation tool has been attached as Appendix .

Table 1

Rank	Re-prioritised projects	Score
1	Digital manufacturing Centre - £8m	22
2	Public realm - £3m	20
3	Sustainable projects - £1.1m	19
4	Library site redevelopment - £4.2m	19
5	Transport Interchange and railway quarter - £8.5m	19
	Programme management - £200,000 (not ranked)	
	Total ask: £25m	

3. All projects have retained their original budgets, so in that respect, there is no change to the original grant ask. This poses further challenges in terms of selecting the projects that can be delivered within the £15.6m budget envelope.
4. Table 2 lists the projects by their original ranking, as selected by the Board to be included in the TIP. The Board chose these projects on the basis of their spatial focus on the town centre.

Table 2

Rank	TIP project prioritisation	Score
1	Sustainable projects - £1.1m	56%
2	Digital manufacturing Centre - £8m	52%
3	Public realm - £3m	51%
4	Transport Interchange and railway quarter - £8.5m	50%
5	Library site redevelopment - £4.2m	46%
	Programme management - £200,000 (not ranked)	
	Total ask: £25m	

### RE-PRIORITISATION

5. For consistency sake, if the same selection method was adopted – spatial focus on the town centre – then the Board needs to decide which of the three projects that scored 19 points each (Table 1) would complement the first and second ranked projects to maximise the spatial impact on the town centre.

6. In making the final decision, the Board:

6.1 must demonstrate how the re-prioritisation process meets the needs of the town. This is a condition of the approved Heads of Terms.

6.2 may wish to test its selection process against the Towns Fund strategic aims, objectives and priorities ((MHCLG, *Towns Fund Guidance*, June 2020):

6.2.1 the overarching aim of the Towns Fund is to drive the sustainable economic regeneration of towns to deliver long term economic and productivity growth

6.2.2 spatial targeting: strong preference will be given to interventions in town centres, gateway areas and key employment sites

6.2.3 Covid-19 recovery: ‘paramount that Covid-19 is factored in the decision-making’

6.2.4 interventions should support clean growth where possible and, at a minimum, not conflict with the achievement of government’s net zero target by 2050.

7. Table 3 lists the three projects that best meet the approach and criteria set out in paragraphs 5 and 6, should the Board choose that methodology to select the projects to be taken forward for delivery.

Table 3

OPTION 1	RATIONALE
Digital Manufacturing and Innovation Centre Library site redevelopment Public realm	Strong strategic spatial approach Town centre re-purposing focus Supports long-term economic and productivity growth (new employment and business generation, and innovation and business support)
Total ask: £15,200,000	Allows for £400,000 for project management & cost advice.

OTHER RE-PRIORITISATION OPTIONS

8. There are several other options that the Board could consider, as outlined in the tables below, should the Board decide not to use the re-prioritisation tool and adopt a different re-prioritisation methodology.

Table 4

OPTION 2	RATIONALE
Transport interchange and railway quarter Public realm Library site redevelopment	Spatial approach – public realm improvements linking the train station (key gateway to the town) with a redeveloped library site in the town centre.
Total ask: £15,700,000	£100,000 over approved grant. Would require a project budget reduction of one or more

	projects to allow for £200,000 project management costs i.e. a total budget reduction of at least £300,000
--	--

Table 5

OPTION 3	RATIONALE
Digital Manufacturing and Innovation Centre Transport interchange and railway quarter	Flagship projects, but no strategic spatial connection. New employment and business generation
Total ask: £16.5m	Requires a budget reduction of at least £900,000

Table 6

OPTION 4	RATIONALE
Transport interchange and railway quarter Sustainable projects Public realm	Focus on sustainable means of transport, but no strategic spatial connection.
Total ask: £12,600,000	£2,800,000 spare cash (after deducting £200,000 for project management costs).  Could accommodate a reduced Library site redevelopment project i.e. just demolition costs.

- Board members are asked to approve the projects they want to take forward for delivery.