AGENDA ITEM 10

Policy Committee – 7th June 2016

Procurement and Delivery of Regeneration Projects

CRAVEN
IN · THE · YORKSHIRE · DALES
DISTRICT

Report of the Assets & Commercial Services Manager

Lead Member Cllr P Mulligan

Ward(s) affected: All Wards

1 Purpose of the Report

To assess the options for the procurement and delivery of regeneration projects using private sector involvement.

2 Recommendations

Members are recommended to;

2.1 Approve the commencement of the procurement of a private sector supplier to form an “Equity” Joint Venture using the Competitive Dialogue process.

2.2 Approve a supplementary revenue estimate of £25,000 funded from the Enabling Efficiency reserve to meet external procurement and legal support, and set up costs.

2.3 Request a further report to Policy Committee to inform Members of the outcome of the first stage of the process to select one of the respondees to the advertisement to enter into a Joint Venture and to approve the selected partner.

3 Background

3.1 The Council has been investigating how it can deliver regeneration schemes in timely manner whilst also generating a return on investment. Discussions have been held with Barnfield Investments about their experience in East Lancashire and the different joint ventures they have with Hyndburn, Rossendale, Burnley and Pendle. In addition the Strategic Director and the Leader of Pendle Borough Council spoke to Members about their experiences of being part of three joint ventures to deliver regeneration schemes that are financially marginal. Members encouraged officers to proceed as quickly as possible to progress a similar approach but tailored to Craven’s circumstances.

3.2 It is clear that a joint venture approach can be used to both deliver schemes that can maximise income to the Council by sharing the developer profit but also to deliver schemes that have regeneration aims but are financially more marginal. Discussions with other local authorities highlight a number of key finds that the Council must consider if a venture of this type is to be successful. These The findings are summarised as follows:-

- The need to bring land, cash and skills together to deliver rural projects and create economic growth
- Use the private sector to generate financial leverage
- Rural projects in general are commercially marginal and slow to gain returns
- Traditional loans take a long time to generate returns
- Risks historically have hindered the progress of marginal projects
- Sharing the burden reduces the risk
- Creation of greater access to skills and experience is paramount
- Investment is maximised and enhances contribution from external funds
- Time and resources required to apply for funds is consuming and costly with no certainty of success
- Opportunity to use assets to generate income and profit and recycle in perpetuity
- A single procurement process will save costs and time and resolve state aid issues
- Will potentially generate a minimum return of 8% to the Council
- Involving the YNYER LEP will allow access to additional funds via the Growth Deal and Growing Places fund

3.3 This report identifies and assesses the options available for the procurement and delivery of regeneration projects. As such it recognizes that a “one-size fits all” is not a simple answer but establishes a solution to be taken forward.

3.4 The report acknowledges that regeneration projects are potentially both complex and marginal for each and every site. Equally it anticipates that sites will have to be grouped together to guarantee a continuous pipeline of work in order to secure private sector investment. The players in this field will require a longer term commitment from the Council in order to stimulate interest. The solution therefore tends towards a dialogue process for procurement and a partnership or Joint Venture for delivery.

4 Procurement

4.1 In order to assess the most appropriate procurement process it is important to understand the options available. The Public Contracts Directive 2014/24/EU provides for five award procedures, rather than the previous four that in brief comprise as follows.

4.2 **Open Procedure**; under which all those interested may respond to the advertisement in the OJEU by submitting a tender for the contract.

4.3 **Restricted Procedure**; under which a selection is made of those who respond to the advertisement and only they are invited to submit a tender for the contract.

4.4 **Competitive Procedure with Negotiation**; under which a selection is made of those who respond to the advertisement and only they are invited to submit an initial tender for the contract. The contracting authority may then open negotiations with the tenderers to seek improved offers. The new Public Contracts Directive provides greater freedom to use this procedure than the previous rules.

4.5 **Competitive Dialogue**; under which a selection is made of those who respond to the advertisement and the contracting authority enters into dialogue with potential bidders, to develop one or more solutions for its requirements and on which chosen bidders will be invited to tender. The new Public Contracts Directive provides greater freedom to use this procedure than the previous rules.

4.6 **Innovation Partnership Procedure**; under which a selection is made of those who respond to the advertisement and the contracting authority uses a negotiated approach to invite suppliers to submit ideas to develop innovative works, supplies or services aimed at meeting a need for which there is no “suitable existing “product” on the market. The contracting authority is allowed to award partnerships to more than one supplier.

4.7 In certain narrowly defined circumstances the contracting authority may also award a contract using the ‘**Negotiated Procedure** without prior publication’. Here the contracting authority would approach one or more suppliers seeking to negotiate the terms of the contract. One of the permitted circumstances is where, for technical or artistic reasons or because of the protection of exclusive rights, the contract can only be carried out by a particular supplier.

4.8 Contracting authorities have a free choice between the open and restricted procedures. The competitive dialogue procedure and the competitive procedure with negotiation are available where certain criteria are met, including where the contract is complex or cannot be purchased ‘off the shelf’. The ‘negotiated procedure without prior publication’ may only be used in the limited circumstances described in the Public Contracts Directive.

4.9 Contracting authorities using the restricted procedure, competitive dialogue procedure and the competitive procedure with negotiation must aim to select a number of suppliers sufficient to ensure genuine competition. Provided there are sufficient suitable candidates, the Public Contracts Directive requires a minimum of five for the restricted procedure, and three for competitive dialogue and competitive procedure with negotiation.

4.10 The Open Procedure is generally used when a contracting authority is concerned regarding the level of market interest in the work on offer and is used therefore to tease as many expressions of interest as possible with all being rewarded with a place within the process. This is not anticipated to be an issue in Craven.

4.11 The Innovation Partnership Procedure and Negotiated Procedure rule themselves out anyway due to their individual quirks so that leaves three alternatives.

4.12 The Restricted Procedure is effectively the traditional procurement process and takes many forms and is the largest form of procurement used, accounting for a large proportion of all procurement activities within local government. The process has been developed over many years and is therefore widely understood with significant experience being built up to meet varying needs of local authorities. However its major disadvantage is the authority's inability to clearly define its aspirations.

4.13 As relatively new procedures both forms of competition via negotiation or dialogue are particularly useful where precise specifications are not possible or where innovative solutions are being sought. The down side is that they have both taken time to bed in and for procurers to gain confidence and experience in their use. The latter is very much the case here in Craven.

4.14 A qualitative assessment is therefore essential to selecting the most appropriate procurement option as detailed within the table below and using the following ratings in general to compare options:-

- **High = 1**
- **Medium = 2**
- **Low = 3**
- **Weak = 1**
- **Adequate = 2**
- **Strong = 3**

Key Issue	**Procurement Procedure**		
	Restricted	**Competitive with Negotiation**	**Competitive Dialogue**
Impact on timetable	Low	High	High
Level of internal resource required and available	Adequate	Weak	Weak
Level of internal expertise and familiarity	Strong	Weak	Weak
Level of external specialist advice and support	Strong	Adequate	Strong
Procurement costs (internal & external)	Low	High	High
Ability to tender successfully	Adequate	Strong	Strong
Market appetite	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Added value brought to procurement process and ultimate outcome	Weak	Strong	Strong
Capability of managing risk	Weak	Strong	Strong
Level of flexibility and adaptability	Weak	Strong	Strong

Appropriate for multiple projects	Weak	Strong	Strong
Score	**19**	**23**	**24**

4.15 In addition using the Restricted Procedure the number of tenderers is controlled, and quicker to evaluate, clarify and award. However savings in these stages are often offset by longer EOI and PQQ stages.

4.16 Using either the Competitive Procedure with Dialogue or Competitive Dialogue will both naturally take longer to procure due to the phased nature of document preparation, market engagement and evaluation of proposals, and in the case of the former this is still relatively new and therefore unused in abundance to date.

4.17 The scores are virtually equal between the two processes that stimulate dialogue and it is acknowledged that both options will enable clearer aspirations to be defined and understood, commitment and compromise to be shared, and will ultimately result in minimised risk and delivery of the most appropriate solution to both parties.

5 Delivery Options

5.1 In order to assess the most suitable delivery relationship model from the many that exist the following three options have been considered:-

- Traditional Client/Supplier
- Partnership
- Joint Venture

5.2 It is important therefore to understand the difference between partnerships and Joint Ventures so the definitions are as follows.

5.3 A partnership is an arrangement where parties, known as partners, agree to cooperate to advance their mutual interests. The partners in a partnership may be individuals, businesses, interest-based organisations, schools, governments or combinations and may partner together to increase the likelihood of each achieving their mission and to amplify their reach. A partnership may result in issuing and holding equity or may be only governed by a contract.

5.4 A Joint Venture (JV) is a business agreement in which the parties agree to develop, for a finite time, a new entity and new assets by contributing equity. They exercise control over the enterprise and consequently share revenues, expenses and assets. There are other types of companies such as JV limited by guarantee, Joint Ventures limited by guarantee with partners holding shares. Companies typically pursue Joint Ventures for one of four reasons: to gain faster entry into a new market; to acquire expertise; to increase production scale, efficiencies, or coverage; or to expand business development by gaining access to distributor networks.

5.5 The Qualitative Appraisal involves undertaking a SWOT analysis and comparing the relative merits and drawbacks for each option. The appraisal is based on a scoring system using star ratings. By its nature the assessment is subjective so scores are therefore supported by accompanying statements based on consultation, market research and previous experience.

5.6 Scores are out of 3 stars where more stars in the strength/opportunity table imply a stronger performer in relation to the issue being considered. The weaknesses/threats tables uses a reverse scoring system, where a higher star rating is indicative that the option carries greater risk of being exposed to the issue being considered. A further sophistication of the scoring mechanism which has not been used would be to weight the star ratings dependent upon the relative importance of the issue being considered but this has not been undertaken in this instance.

5.7 Key Strengths and Opportunities:-

*** Option has little or no scope to address this issue**
**** Option has some scope to address the issue**
***** Option has significant scope to address this issue**

Key Strengths & Opportunities	Traditional Client/Supplier	Partnership	Joint Venture
Ability to contribute to the objectives of the Craven District Council Plan	Supplier is ordinarily short term and primary interest is making a return and getting repeat business *	Potential to use the council objectives to enable one-off projects **	Potential to develop a joint business plan that incorporates the aspirations of both organisations ***
Ability to facilitate investment	No private sector leverage *	Private sector expertise and financial band width **	Private sector willing to commit cash, and have covenant to secure additional bank funding ***
Ability to facilitate additional funding streams and grants	No private sector leverage but CDC have good success rate achieving ED funding **	Joint ownership and additional leverage provided by the private sector **	Joint ownership and additional leverage provided by the private sector **
Potential for increased staff development, recruitment and retention	Potential for increasing these levers is very limited *	Specialist skills will be readily available to fill gaps and work together **	Specialist skills will be readily available to fill gaps and work as an integrated team ***
Potential to maximise revenue and return	Insufficient CDC capital reserves to fund projects *	Potential to make good revenue and return ***	Joint ownership of investment and cash flow **
Potential to minimise procurement costs	Very time consuming, costly	Potential to establish a framework	A single procurement

and lead in times	and complex to undertake on many one-off occasions *	approach **	exercise to cover a range of projects over a longer term duration ***
Capacity and flexibility of resource to overcome complexities	Existing CDC resource capacity and skills is very limited *	Private sector expertise will be available **	Appointment of the private sector will bring expertise from other projects and a significant company-wide resource pool ***
Expertise and sharing of ideas	No streamlining between the organisations *	Ability to work together in harmony and streamline approaches ***	Ability to work together in harmony and streamline approaches ***
Scope for innovation and added value	None of these are currently measured or incentivised in any way **	Private sector will bring best practise from other projects and is incentivised to innovate, improve, and remove duplication and inefficiency ***	Private sector will bring best practise from other projects and is incentivised to innovate, improve, and remove duplication and inefficiency ***
Understanding what is required	Can be done but more difficult to clarify exactly what is aspired **	Working together to develop the aspiration will benefit both organisations ***	Working together to develop the aspiration will benefit both organisations ***
Risk management and sharing in a commercial framework	Little scope due to differing aspirations and objectives, and CDC is not used to managing risk in a commercial environment *	Potential to jointly deliver each project to maximise joint benefit. Wider expertise from the private sector ***	Potential to develop a joint business plan that incorporates the aspirations of both organisations. Wider expertise from the private sector ***
Partnering themes and opportunities	Very little scope at all *	Potential to use each project to enable further opportunity of working together **	Potential to develop a joint business plan that incorporates the aspirations of both organisations ***
Potential to maximise the use of integrated teams and supply chains	Very difficult for CDC to benefit from this option in short term scenarios *	Working together and a willingness by the private sector to invest other resources **	Working together and a willingness by the private sector to utilise a wider support team **
Project identification, appraisal and solution development	Limited expertise within CDC hinders the development of	Tailored project appraisal and development skills	Enhanced project appraisal and development skills

	potential projects **	from the private sector ***	from wider experience of the private sector ***
Planning and preparation	Limited resource and expertise within CDC **	Potential to link with the project appraisal and become more streamlined ***	Potential to link with the project appraisal and become more streamlined ***
Preparedness	Ready and part of North Yorkshire Procurement Partnership ***	Much work to do *	Much work to do *
Total Score	**23**	**38**	**42**

5.8 Key Weaknesses & Threats:-

- * Option carries little or no risk of being exposed to this issue
- ** Option carries some risk of being exposed to this issue
- *** Option carries significant risk of being exposed to this issue

Key Weaknesses & Threats	Traditional Client/Supplier	Partnership	Joint Venture
The Council	This is the tried and tested approach so little resistance is anticipated *	This is new so a high level of interrogation and reservation is anticipated **	This is new so a high level of interrogation and reservation is anticipated ***
Impact on procurement timetable	Relatively simple procurement exercise using standard terms and conditions so unlikely to delay the timetable *	Increased volume of procurement and tender assessment processes ***	Increased volume of procurement and tender assessment processes ***
HR implications	None whatsoever *	Some staff may be recharged to each project **	Some staff may be recharged to the Joint Venture **
Management of procurement process	Little if any threat as this is the current default option *	A more volumetric procurement process that will require external support **	A more complex procurement process that will require external support **
Resource capacity and expertise	Standard approach but significantly affected by the availability of appropriate resource	Private sector expertise will be available **	Appointment of the private sector will bring expertise from other projects and a significant company-

	***		wide resource pool *
Previous experience of delivering large projects	Little experience to date ***	Private sector experience will be available *	Private sector experience will be available *
Change	No significant threat as change is nil *	Slight change so clarity of roles is key **	Slight change so clarity of roles is key but experience already exists within the market **
Lack of market interest and competition	Well established local market already exists for some services and will be very interested **	Strong market interest for individual projects and local experience already exists **	Adequate market interest for packages of work and reasonably local experience already exists ***
Poor tender documents	Tender documents is the main weakness ***	Potential to be clearer and more specific around what is required **	Clarity will be a priority of both organisations *
Robustness and state of readiness	Standard documents and some sites already outlined but relies exclusively on CDC **	Complex processes and some sites already outlined but relies heavily on CDC **	Complex processes and some sites already outlined but mitigated by private sector experience **
Affordability issues including implementation costs	Little scope to influence market forces ***	Potential ability to influence cost **	Significant opportunity to reduce cost *
Inappropriate supplier selection	Total reliance on the marketplace ***	Ability to mitigate through the due diligence process, but perhaps more than once **	Ability to mitigate through the due diligence process *
Inability to demonstrate VfM and council objectives	Total reliance on marketplace in terms of VfM but objectives can be captured within the specification ***	Ability to mitigate through the due diligence process **	Potential to develop a joint business plan that incorporates the aspirations of both organisations *
Total Score	**27**	**26**	**23**

5.9 A Quantitative Appraisal using a ten-year medium term project as an example is included within Appendix A at the end of this report and merely to illustrate and compare how costs will vary depending upon the delivery model. As such the values used are estimates of the staff resource that will be required and their duration of involvement. A summary is as follows:-

Delivery Model	CDC Staff Costs
Traditional Arrangement	£682,145.83
Partnership	£512,166.67
Joint Venture	£433,687.50

5.10 The traditional arrangement is the standard client/contractor model as noted within the Quantitative Appraisal above and will involve several fragmented procurement exercises and potentially more than one contractor. Continuity and seamless delivery will therefore be affected.

5.11 The appraisal suggests three outcomes as follows:-

- By transferring risk and responsibility to the private sector will promote the sharing of certain functions
- Council staff resource participation and direct costs will reduce proportionally
- The overall project cost will decrease significantly by a reduction in procurement and management

5.12 In addition there will be a significant level of investment and additional financial leverage provided by the private sector.

5.13 At this stage it is very difficult to carry out further analysis and predict other financial outcomes as this will depend entirely upon the nature of the projects selected for development and the detailed solution, and equally the investment/equity share ratio of the delivery model and partner chosen.

6 Risk Management

6.1 Some of the key risks and suggested mitigation measures associated are outlined within the table below. Many of these are included with the “Weaknesses and Threats” part of the qualitative appraisal above.

6.2 This list is not meant to be exhaustive but it is intended to capture high level risks that should be addressed. The ratings suggest the severity of each risk as follows:-

*** Low severity risk**
**** Medium severity risk**
***** High severity risk**

Risk	Mitigation	Severity		
		Traditional Client/Supplier	Partnership	Joint Venture
Procurement				
Delays in procurement timetable	Establish clear project plan for delivery and ensure resources are available to achieve key milestones	*	**	**
Poor tender documents	Procurement expertise used to draft tender documents, due diligence and sign off using a dedicated tender team supported by external specialist if applicable	***	**	*
Sufficient market interest	Undertake soft market exercise and retain contact with interested organisations	**	*	*
Failure to agree contract terms and selection of inappropriate supplier	Be clear, open and transparent about the opportunity being presented, and what is expected, what can/can't be negotiated on. Hold bidder open days, clarification meetings, and visit reference sites. Maintain co-operative and professional relationship with all tenderers and develop robust assessment and selection criteria	***	*	*
People				
Resource availability, expertise and commitment to procure new contracts	Strong leadership and robust monitoring, use of formal project team, and external support as required. Clear distinction of roles and responsibilities	**	**	**
Experience to date	Establish robust project selection criteria to ensure this fits with the calibre of the market interest. Use the vast	***	*	*

	experience of the private sector			
Finance				
Affordability	Utilise the ARIS, select projects that attract external funding streams, prioritise and rank projects according to their likelihood and time to deliver, and make the most of private sector interest and investment	***	*	*
Total Score		**17**	**10**	**9**

7 Summary of Appraisals

7.1 Scores from the three qualitative appraisals are summarised below:-

Qualitative Appraisal	Traditional Client/Supplier	Partnership	Joint Venture
Strengths & Opportunities	23	38	**42**
Weaknesses & Threats	27	26	**23**
Risks	17	10	**9**

7.2 For clarity:-

- The higher the score for Strengths & Opportunities the more the option has scope to improve this issue.
- The lower the score for Weaknesses & Threats, and Risks, the less the option is exposed to this issue.

7.2 The traditional Client/Supplier is a high risk, low gain solution. It is the current delivery model and as such is limited and very much in danger of obstructing change and the aspirations of the council. It is the easiest and possibly cheapest option in the short term but it has the distinct disadvantage of denying total clarity that could therefore thwart the future by seriously affecting the outcome of mid to long term projects.

7.3 Partnership and Joint Venture are both lower risk and higher gain solutions and there is not a lot to choose between them. However there is a degree of apprehension as they both require entering into unknown territory. That being said provided the associated risks can be managed effectively through the procurement process and during the life of the contract, both offer tremendous opportunities to address the primary objectives of the Council and a major step change in the future delivery of current aspirations. It is also generally recognised that partnerships are more akin to delivering service improvement whereas JV’s are utilised to support investment of one nature or another.

7.4 The figures in yellow/bold represent the optimum option for each qualitative appraisal theme. On this basis the Joint Venture option is the all-round optimum so a further high level appraisal is therefore required as follows to determine the most appropriate Joint Venture model.

	Contractual Joint Venture	Equity Joint Venture
Description	• Contractual agreement for public and private sector organisations to jointly target a market or business opportunity with or without creating a new legal entity, or altering the equity composition of either organisation	• A commercial arrangement whereby two or more partners contribute assets, investment and/or expertise to a separate entity • The partners share the benefits and risks of the JV while collaborating to achieve a shared vision
Advantages	• Enables significant independence to pursue commercial opportunities • Provides significant external expertise and investment to be brought to service provision • Typically suitable for pursuit of easily defined activities with a clear revenue stream and is less suitable for encouraging pursuit of new revenue streams	• Can deliver significant private sector expertise and capital investment into service • Enables entity to pursue commercial opportunities with a greater degree of freedom • Greater freedom to drive cost efficiencies • Typically suited to more complex projects or pursuit of new products and services
Risks & Challenges	• Cash may be required to fund the activities covered by JV remit • Generally restricted to borrowing from parent department; unable to seek non-Government equity • Though no equity is required to enter into a JV partnership, there is an element of operational risk around working with a separate entity, with complexity in delivery	• Less ability for Local Authority to exert direct control over service quality or pricing • Risk is shared, but so is return, accountability and control • State Aid and the Competition Act 1998 may prevent LA's from procuring services from a JV they hold a stake in
Governance	• Council employees can be given a governance role	• Council employees can be one of the equity partners in the JV, and can also have roles in governance

7.5 An equity Joint Venture appears the most appropriate and viable option and is the option that has been used successfully for 8 years by our neighbours at Pendle Borough Council who currently operate three separate versions.

7.6 A pipeline of potential projects is included within Appendix B at the end of this report. At this moment in time the list is notional and will require detailed appraisal by the Joint Venture to determine the viability of, and solution for each project.

8 Financial Implications

8.1 This assessment report assumes that the Council Owned Trading Company will be the partner to any private sector organization that is procured as a Joint Venture for longer term projects.

8.2 The Council's procurement and set up costs as part of the Joint Venture of approximately £25,000 will come from the Effecting Efficiencies reserve.

8.3 Section 24 LGA 1988 provides the Council with the power to provide a wide range of financial assistance to the Joint Venture including making a grant or loan to it and as the Joint Venture is a body corporate the Council may under Section 24 (2)(d) acquire share or loan capital in it.

8.4 If the Council intends to borrow to lend to the Joint Venture regulation 25 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 2003/3146) treats the giving of a loan by a local authority to a third party i.e. the Joint Venture as capital expenditure. As such it would need to be confirmed by Full Council.

8.5 It is expected the Joint Venture will make a trading loss in year 1 due to set up costs. Thereafter all dividends from sale of assets or sustainable income will be paid to the Council in proportion with the shared equity agreement. It is expected that all dividends will be used to invest further funding within the Joint Venture so unless the Joint Venture ceases or one party wishes to dissolve the arrangement then the funding will be tied up for the long term.

8.6 The Joint Venture will not have a separate bank account and all transactions will be posted through the Council's bank account. The Company will use the Council's financial facilities and ensure all income expenditure and VAT is correctly coded to the Joint Venture.

8.7 The Joint Venture will be responsible for the engagement of an external auditor.

9 Legal Implications

9.1 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 provides local authorities with the power to do anything an individual may do subject to a number of limitations (this is referred to as the General Power). A local authority may exercise the General Power for its own purpose, for a commercial purpose and/or for the benefit of others.

Section 4 of the Localism Act 2011 requires that where a local authority exercises/uses the general power for a commercial purpose it must do so through a company i.e. the Joint Venture.

9.2 Under Part V of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the council also has a power to establish companies which can be wholly controlled or influenced by the Council. The Joint Venture will be influenced by the Council and under Part V will be subject to the Local Authorities (Companies) Order 1995.

10 Contributions to Corporate Priorities

The proposals in this report support the Council priorities of 'Financial Resilience' by ensuring the Council remains sustainable and can continue to deliver essential front line services and 'Enterprising Craven' by stimulating economic growth through land development and regeneration schemes.

11 Author of the Report

Ian Halton, Assets & Commercial Services Manager,
ihalton@cravendc.gov.uk,
01756706329

AGENDA ITEM 10

Appendix A

Regeneration Projects

Traditional Arrangement:	**Pre Go-live**	**Post Go-live**										**CDC Costs**
Staff Resource	**Y0**	**Y1**	**Y2**	**Y3**	**Y4**	**Y5**	**Y6**	**Y7**	**Y8**	**Y9**	**Y10**	
Overseer (P/T)												£41,250.00
Project Manager (F/T)												£345,937.50
Planner (P/T)												£64,166.67
Designer (External & P/T)												£36,666.67
Quantity Surveyor (P/T)												£80,000.00
Finance (P/T)												£36,666.67
Legal (P/T)												£20,625.00
Procurement (P/T)												£45,833.33
Contractor Construction Teams (F/T)												
Marketing (External P/T &)												£5,500.00
Sales (External & P/T)												£5,500.00
											Total	**£682,145.83**

Partnership:	**Pre Go-live**	**Post Go-live**										**CDC Costs**
Staff Resource	**Y0**	**Y1**	**Y2**	**Y3**	**Y4**	**Y5**	**Y6**	**Y7**	**Y8**	**Y9**	**Y10**	
Overseer (P/T)												£20,625.00
Project Manager (F/T)												£299,812.50
Planner (Shared & P/T)												£25,520.83
Designer (Shared & P/T)												£18,333.33
Quantity Surveyor (P/T)												£60,000.00
Finance (P/T)												£27,500.00
Legal (P/T)												£31,875.00
Procurement (P/T)												£17,500.00
Partner Construction Team (F/T)												
Marketing (External P/T &)												£5,500.00
Sales (External & P/T)												£5,500.00
											Total	**£512,166.67**

Joint Venture:	**Pre Go-live**	**Post Go-live**										**CDC Costs**
Staff Resource	**Y0**	**Y1**	**Y2**	**Y3**	**Y4**	**Y5**	**Y6**	**Y7**	**Y8**	**Y9**	**Y10**	
Overseer (P/T)												£16,500.00
Project Manager (F/T)												£253,687.50
Planner (Shared & P/T)												£16,041.67
Designer (Shared & P/T)												£10,833.33
Quantity Surveyor (P/T)												£60,000.00
Finance (P/T)												£27,500.00
Legal (P/T)												£20,625.00
Procurement (P/T)												£17,500.00
JV Construction Team (F/T)												
Marketing (External P/T &)												£5,500.00
Sales (External & P/T)												£5,500.00
											Total	**£433,687.50**

Key: CDC F/T · CDC P/T · Shared P/T · External P/T · Contractor F/T

AGENDA ITEM 10

Appendix B

Potential & Outline Pipeline of Regeneration Projects

Project	Description	Estimated Development Costs	Outputs
Burberry Factory	Soon to be redundant Burberry factory to be given to the "community" for redevelopment. The site is approximately 1 hectare in size and is a mixture of old mills, weaving sheds, and more modern units. The site could be developed in a number of phases to create a mixed use development.	£5m	25 dwellings 1,110 m2 space 44 FTE
Skipton Rock Quarry	Redundant area of a quarry on the edge of Skipton that can be leased on a long term peppercorn rent with an overage to be agreed. The site is owned by Tarmac. The site would be suitable for storage and light industrial.	£2m	1110 m2 space 30 FTE
Threshfield Quarry	A large quarry that is the primary regeneration opportunity in the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Aim is to create business space and visitor facilities.	£11m	4,885 m2 space 195 FTE 70,000 visitors
Bentham Rural Business Park	To create a an improved junction at the bottom of Station Rd that will create an improved access to Angus Fire and a new access to land that can develop business space, a car park or a public park and will also open up land for 2 ha of employment and 60 dwellings.	£1.5m	60 dwellings 4,440 m2 space 178 FTE
Engine Shed Lane Depot	Engine Shed Lane Depot is an old rail sidings and buildings on a 5,500m2 site that is currently used as a waste management depot. Part of the site is no longer required therefore there is an opportunity to refurbish or build some light industrial units. The existing buildings, although not ideal, are sound and the site sits within an existing industrial park.	£1.5m	1,000 m2 space 27 FTE
Total		£24.8m	85 dwellings 21,744 m2 space 840 FTEs 70,000 visitors

Other Possible Projects:
Langcliffe Depot & Quarry, North of Settle
Land at rear of Victoria Hall, Settle (Former Kirkgate Depot)