

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)					Weighted Score (max 99 available)		
Project Title / Town: Whittlesey - Variable Highways Message Signs (VHMS)					Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)		81.0
Name: Date:		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria					
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)		Comments	Weighting	Mark - Edit	Total
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes		Market Failure is not a relevant issue for a Highways project but the need for these road signs is strong, well described and evidenced	2	x 2	= 4.0
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021		According to the application the project spend will be completed by February 21. As this is a modest project in scale with no consents required, this should be achievable.	2	x 2	= 4.0
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified		Milestones broken down, though as the project is still to be tendered the costs are missing a similar level of detail	1	x 3	= 3.0
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent		Modest project, no consents required, all land in Cambs CC ownership. Main risk is cost over run after procurement exercise.	3	x 3	= 9.0
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified		Outputs are clear and appropriate for a project of this scale and type	5	x 3	= 15.0
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes		The Fen's following the CPIER analysis, was singled out for strategic investment via the support a process of creating market town plans. This project accords with the Whittlesey plan.	5	x 3	= 15.0
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided		Public Highways project - no state aid issues	1	x 3	= 3.0
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information		Only ball park total estimate with no breakdown.	3	x 2	= 6.0
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%		Given the pressure on local authority resources currently with the pandemic, the secure contributions from the town council and Fenland Leader Fund is laudable.	4	x 2	= 8.0
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money		This project really merits a 2.5 score. It delivers some leverage (13%) and indirectly supports 150 businesses making it an acceptable project for CPCA funding.	5	x 2	= 10.0
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assesment 3. Risks identified and explained		Again this project really merits a 2.5 score. This is a modest relatively low risk project. The main risk being cost over run due in part to the effect of covid on the construction market and the to the variable ground conditions that exists in the town.	2	x 2	= 4.0
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarity Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.		Approve at the request amount of £57,500 being the maximum sum permitted to this project. This award to be subject to the following conditions: 1. Copy of the tender report by the end of November 2020; 2. Details of how any cost over run will be managed.		Total Score		81.0

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)				Weighted Score (max 99 available)			
				Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)			84.0
Project Title / Town: Wisbech Market Place							
Name: Hewdon Consulting Date: 17.9.20		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria					
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)	Comments	Weighting		Mark - Edit	Total
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	Refurbishment of the makret squire is a public good	2	x	3	= 6.0
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021	Project completes summer 2021 with CPCA funding drawn down alongside matvch. It might be possible to adjust this.	2	x	1	= 2.0
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified	Full cost plan but programme not developed fully	1	x	2	= 2.0
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent	Final programme awaited from engineer setting out tender route etc but this is only a 16 week construction job so low risk. No planning required but TRO needed.	3	x	3	= 9.0
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified	Output is m2 public realm enhanced	5	x	3	= 15.0
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	This project is in the masterplan which has a good fit with CPIER	5	x	3	= 15.0
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided	Public realm is a public good with no state aid issues.	1	x	3	= 3.0
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information	Detailed budget provided	3	x	3	= 9.0
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%	50% match from town and county council	4	x	3	= 12.0
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money	Competitive tender for outputs which are also intermediate outcomes but no Vfm information provided	5	x	1	= 5.0
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assesment 3. Risks identified and explained	No formal risk register but main risks set out and discussed	2	x	3	= 6.0
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarify Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.			Total Score			84.0

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)				Weighted Score (max 99 available)			
				Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)			78.0
Project Title / Town: St Ives Footfall Counters							
Name: Hewdon Consulting Date: 17.9.20		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria					
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)	Comments	Weighting		Mark - Edit	Total
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	St Ives is too small to have commercial provision of counters	2	x	3	= 6.0
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021	Planned expenditure is rental of counters so confirmation is needed that this can be capitalised upfront. Installation complete end 2020	2	x	3	= 6.0
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified	Project is ready for contract award	1	x	3	= 3.0
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent	Project ready to be awarded to market leader	3	x	3	= 9.0
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified	Outputs defined as m2 enhanced public realm. Plan includes highest quality public realm as outcome	5	x	2	= 10.0
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes	The masterplan fits with the LIS and CPIER and this project will enable progress on the masterplan to be monitored	5	x	3	= 15.0
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided	Public infrastructure does not raise state aid issues.	1	x	3	= 3.0
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information	Contract ready to be awarded	3	x	3	= 9.0
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%	Small amount of ERDF contributed as match	4	x	2	= 8.0
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money	Council has considered VFM but no information offered.	5	x	1	= 5.0
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assesment 3. Risks identified and explained	No formal risk register but main risks identified.	2	x	2	= 4.0
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarify Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.		Approval subject to both parties	Total Score			78.0

Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus: Application Appraisal Matrix (with Weighting)					Weighted Score (max 99 available)				
Project Title / Town: Fit for the Future: Huntingdonshire Market Towns (Huntingdon, St Ives and Ramsey)					Minimum pass is 74 marks (75%)			75.0	
Name: Date:		0 = not answered 1 = does not meet the criteria 2 = meets the criteria							
Criteria	Definitions	Marking Guide (1-5)		Comments	Weighting		Mark - Edit	=	Total
Rationale	Does the application evidence strong market failure?	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes		Market Failure argument is that by not investing in external support the Council would be unable to bring forward viable schemes. In light of the effect covid has had on the finances of local council's this is accepted.	2	x	3	=	6.0
Timescales	What is the planned implementation timetable and can spend be achieved by March 2022?	1. No, expenditure extends beyond 31 March 2021 2.Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 3. Yes, expenditure achieved by March 2021 but further work on the project, using alternative funding sources, continues after March 2021		According to the application the project spend will be completed by end of October 21, though no details / breakdown is given.	2	x	3	=	6.0
Activities/Milestones	How well defined are the principal activities and what more development work is recommended for the full application?	1. Not defined/inadequate 2. Activities broken down 3. Activities with key milestones identified		Few Milestones given in application, in discussion with the applicant they have assumed the capacity building work will be tendered in September, completed by end of Oct / early November in time for subsequent M Town bids to the CA in November.	1	x	2	=	2.0
Delivery Arrangements	How developed is the project plan and does it have the following attributes? e.g. route to and level of risk in securing land, planning and remaining funding if build or transport project e.g. route to and level of risk in securing remaining funding and competent/experienced delivery resources if a service	1.No strategy to secure any of the key elements 2.Poor strategy to secure some of the key elements 3.Good strategy to secure ALL of the key elements but high risks apparent		Minimal detail given in application, in discussion with the applicant confirmed project will be managed by the Towns Board and allocated a project manager. This Board reports directly to their Exec and Leader.	3	x	3	=	9.0
Outputs/Outcomes	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates outcomes that make a strategic-level impact against the approved Market Town Masterplan	1. No Output and outcome information 2. Output and outcome information not clearly specified 3. Outputs and outcome detailed clearly specified		No Output and outcome information, though in discussion with the applicant it was confirmed that a minimum of 1 bid per town would be submitted in November 2020 to the CPCA.	5	x	2	=	10.0
Strategic Fit	Because the value of funding being requested can be considered a Strategic Investment, it is important that the application demonstrates good fit with the CPIER, Skills Strategy, or LIS	1. No 2. Partially 3. Yes		Huntingdon, St Ives and Ramsey following the CPIER analysis have been singled out for strategic investment via the support a process of creating market town plans. How this project accords with these plans is not clear.	5	x	2	=	10.0
State Aid	Is the project State Aid compliant? Has information been submitted on why state aid does not apply?	1. No information 2. Insufficient information provided 3. Sufficient information provided		If normal Council procurement routes are followed then assumed there will be no state aid issues	1	x	2	=	2.0
Costs	Are costs set out, at least as an initial budget estimate?	1. No cost information 2. Some top level cost information 3. Breakdown of cost information		Only ball park total estimate with no breakdown.	3	x	2	=	6.0
Resourcing	Because the value of funding being requested, it is important that there is good leverage and/or match funding	1. No match funding 2. Yes, match funding - <50% 3. Yes, match funding >50%		Given the pressure on local authority resources currently with the pandemic, the secure contributions from the town council and Fenland Leader Fund is laudable.	4	x	2	=	8.0
VFM	Because the value of funding being requested and limited resources allocated to each town, it is important that the application demonstrates a competitive cost per outcomes	1. No VFM information offered 2. Poor VFM 3. Good value for money		With few outputs or targets it is impossible to assess VFM	5	x	2	=	10.0
Risks	Is there a realistic assessment of risks?	1. No risks identified 2. Poor risk assesment 3. Risks identified and explained		Some attempt made, which is adequate given the circumstances.	2	x	3	=	6.0
Recommendation(s)	Approval and progress onto next stage (EAP and CA Board approval) Push back on applicant further information or clarity Reject as unsuitable. Please comment to explain recommendation decision.	Approve at the amount requested subject to the following conditions: A copy of each consultancy report produced with this funding is submitting to the CPCA by end November 2020; Details of the projects governance arrangements are submitted in writing; a minimum one bid for each town is submitted to the CPCA in November; the Council's finance team confirms how they intend to capitalise this grant by end of September.			Total Score			75.0	