

Evidence of Need (40%)

Evidence of need considers to what extent the proposed intervention addresses the challenges identified by the Burton Regeneration Strategy 2019 and the Town Investment Plan. Interventions will be ranked according to how many of the challenges and opportunities they meet, alignment with the TIP framework, rationale, deliverability and scale of outcomes.

Top 3 ranked projects	4
4 - 6 ranked projects	3
7 - 9 ranked projects	2
10 - 11 ranked projects	1

Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration) (10%)

East Staffordshire Borough Council is the lead authority and accountable body for Burton upon Trent's Town Investment Plan and subsequent Town Deal, being one of the three signatories to the agreement. As such, the advisory group of the political administration will rank the proposed interventions according to preference.

Top 3 ranked projects	4
4 - 6 ranked projects	3
7 - 9 ranked projects	2
10 - 11 ranked projects	1

Public Consultation Response (10%)

The consultation of the proposed interventions for the Town Investment Plan resulted in just under 900 responses from members of the public. For each project, there is an identified 'net support percentage' that is the difference between the percentage of respondents that said they supported the project, minus those who said they didn't, ranked from highest to lowest.

Top 3 ranked projects	4
4 - 6 ranked projects	3
7 - 9 ranked projects	2
10 - 11 ranked projects	1

Benefit and Cost Ratio / Economic Analysis (20%)

The Benefit and Cost Ratio (BCR) is a quantitative indicator that summarises the overall 'value for money' of each proposed intervention. This is a ratio that shows how much economic value and benefit is produced for every £1 of investment. A higher BCR means that more benefit could be realised from the intervention.

Top 3 ranked projects	4
4 - 6 ranked projects	3
7 - 9 ranked projects	2
10 - 11 ranked projects	1

Town Deal Board View (10%)

The Burton upon Trent Town Deal Board is responsible for developing the Town Investment Plan and the Chair of the Board is the other signatory to the Town Deal (alongside Government). The views of the individual members of the Board will be compiled in order to rank the proposed interventions by taking an average score for each project.

Top 3 ranked projects	4
4 - 6 ranked projects	3
7 - 9 ranked projects	2
10 - 11 ranked projects	1

Stakeholder Engagement Response (10%)

Alongside the public consultation were two stakeholder workshops attended by 26 participants from the wider stakeholder group. Each participant cast a vote for their top three preferred interventions, which have then been compiled and ranked from highest to lowest.

Top 3 ranked projects	4
4 - 6 ranked projects	3
7 - 9 ranked projects	2
10 - 11 ranked projects	1

	Project A	Project B	Project C	Project D	Project E	Project F	Project G	Project H	Project I	Project J	Project K
	BRFC	Sinai	UoW	High St	Library	Bridge	Towpath	Cycle	A511*	BSDC	St Peters*
Evidence of Need											
Alignment with TIP Framework	2	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
Links to Challenges/Opportunities	2	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	2
Rationale	3	1	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	2	3
Deliverability	2	2	1	3	4	3	4	4	2	3	4
Scale and Achievability of Outcomes	2	2	1	2	3	2	4	4	2	3	2
Total Score	11	11	12	17	17	15	18	19	11	13	15
Rank	9	9	8	3	3	5	2	1	9	7	5
Benefit and Cost Ratio											
BCR	2.4	2.3	6.7	2.7	2.2	2.7	2.1	2.9	0	3.9	0
Rank	6	7	1	4	8	4	9	3	10	2	10
Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration)											
Final Rank	10	11	6	3	3	9	1	5	8	2	7
Town Deal Board View											
Average	7.53333	9.8	5.53333	2.33333	4.86667	5.66667	5.6	5.86667	5.73333	6.2	6.86667
Rank	10	11	3	1	2	5	4	7	6	8	9
Public Consultation Response											
Net Support	69	16.5	16	51.5	0	17	46.5	39.5	19	27	25
Rank	1	9	10	2	11	8	3	4	7	5	6
Stakeholder Engagement Response											
Votes	2	4	4	8	3	2	4	7	9	3	4
Rank	10	4	4	2	8	10	4	3	1	8	4

	1			2			3			4			5			6		
	Project A			Project B			Project C			Project D			Project E			Project F		
	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses
Evidence of need	2	Strong public support for the proposal.	Low support from other engagements and average evidence of need.	2	Higher support from stakeholder engagement.	Low consultation support generally. Not strong on BCR and need.	2	Good levels of support from stakeholders and Lead Accountable Authority.	Lower public support	4	Strong support across all consultation, high BCR and evidence for need of intervention.	n/a	4	Strong evidence of need and high (average) support from Town Deal Board and Accountable Authority.	BCR could be stronger. Net 0% from public consultation.	3	Strong BCR and good evidence of need.	Lower support from engagement with exception of Town Deal Board.
Benefit and Cost Ratio / Economic Analysis	3			4			3			2								
Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration)	1			3			4			4								
Town Deal Board View	1			4			4			4								
Public Consultation Response	4			1			4			1								
Stakeholder Engagement Response	1			3			4			2								
	7			8			9			10			11					
	Project G			Project H			Project I			Project J			Project K					
	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses	Pts	Strong Points	Weaknesses			
Evidence of need	4	Good evidence of need and strong across all consultation engagement.	BCR score isn't as high as others	4	Good on evidence of need and BCR value with strong consultation support generally.	Lower support from Town Deal Board, but still not low overall	2	Good support from stakeholders and general support from Town Deal Board.	Missing information to inform the BCR. Project does not perform as well across most criteria.	2	Very strong on BCR and support from the Lead Authority.	Average score on evidence of need and middling support via consultation.	3	Good evidence of need and consultation response.	Missing information to inform the BCR. Average support from Town Deal Board and Accountable Authority.			
Benefit and Cost Ratio / Economic Analysis	2			4			1			4								
Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration)	4			3			2			4								
Town Deal Board View	3			2			3			2								
Public Consultation Response	4			3			2			3								
Stakeholder Engagement Response	3			4			4			2								

			1		2		3		4	
			Project A		Project B		Project C		Project D	
	Maximum scores	Weighting %	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%
Evidence of Need	4.00	40.00	2.00	20.00	2.00	20.00	2.00	20.00	4.00	40.00
Benefit and Cost Ratio / Economic Analysis	4.00	20.00	3.00	15.00	2.00	10.00	4.00	20.00	3.00	15.00
Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration)	4.00	10.00	1.00	2.50	1.00	2.50	3.00	7.50	4.00	10.00
Town Deal Board View	4.00	10.00	1.00	2.50	1.00	2.50	4.00	10.00	4.00	10.00
Public Consultation Response	4.00	10.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	5.00	1.00	2.50	4.00	10.00
Stakeholder Engagement Response	4.00	10.00	1.00	2.50	3.00	7.50	3.00	7.50	4.00	10.00
Grand Total	24.00	100.00		52.50		47.50		67.50		95.00
				Project A		Project B		Project C		Project D

			5		6		7		8		9		10		11	
			Project E		Project F		Project G		Project H		Project I		Project J		Project K	
	Maximum scores	Weighting %	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%	Pts	%
Evidence of Need	4.00	40.00	4.00	40.00	3.00	30.00	4.00	40.00	4.00	40.00	2.00	20.00	2.00	20.00	3.00	30.00
Benefit and Cost Ratio / Economic Analysis	4.00	20.00	2.00	10.00	3.00	15.00	2.00	10.00	4.00	20.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	20.00	1.00	5.00
Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration)	4.00	10.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	10.00	3.00	7.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	5.00
Town Deal Board View	4.00	10.00	4.00	10.00	3.00	7.50	3.00	7.50	2.00	5.00	3.00	7.50	2.00	5.00	2.00	5.00
Public Consultation Response	4.00	10.00	1.00	2.50	2.00	5.00	4.00	10.00	3.00	7.50	2.00	5.00	3.00	7.50	3.00	7.50
Stakeholder Engagement Response	4.00	10.00	2.00	5.00	1.00	2.50	3.00	7.50	4.00	10.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	7.50
Grand Total	24.00	100.00		77.50		65.00		85.00		90.00		52.50		67.50		60.00
				Project E		Project F		Project G		Project H		Project I		Project J		Project K

Rank	Project	Description	Score	Cost
1st	Project D	High Street Property Intervention	95.00	£5,000,000
2nd	Project H	Cycle Routes	90.00	£2,983,000
3rd	Project G	Canal Towpath	85.00	£525,000
4th	Project E	Library Relocation into Market Hall	77.50	£7,300,000
5th	Project C	University of Wolverhampton	67.50	£2,000,000
6th	Project J	Burton & South Derbyshire College	67.50	£3,100,000
7th	Project F	Washlands Bridge	65.00	£7,500,000
8th	Project K	St Peters Bridge/Transport Model	60.00	£150,000
9th	Project A	Burton Rugby Football Club	52.50	£1,122,000
10th	Project I	A511 Corridor Project	52.50	£2,400,000
11th	Project B	Sinai Park House	47.50	£3,146,246

Total Selected Projects:	£20,908,000.00
Remaining Available Funds:	£4,092,000.00
Total Unselected Projects:	£14,318,246.00
Total of all Projects:	£35,226,246.00



Balanced Scorecard Summary

Scorecard Ranking

Scoring Summary

Weighted Scores

Final Ranking Summary

Proposed Project Prioritisation

Rank	Project	Description	Score	Cost
1st	Project D	High Street Property Intervention	95.00	£3,000,000
2nd	Project H	Cycle Routes	90.00	£1,425,000
3rd	Project G	Canal Towpath	85.00	£525,000
4th	Project E	Library Relocation into Market Hall	77.50	£7,300,000
5th	Project C	University of Wolverhampton	67.50	£2,000,000
6th	Project J	Burton & South Derbyshire College	67.50	£3,100,000
7th	Project F	Washlands Bridge	65.00	£7,500,000
8th	Project K	St Peters Bridge/Transport Model	60.00	£150,000
9th	Project A	Burton Rugby Football Club	52.50	£1,122,000
10th	Project I	A511 Corridor Project	52.50	£2,400,000
11th	Project B	Sinai Park House	47.50	£3,146,246

Total Selected Projects:	£25,000,000.00
Remaining Available Funds:	£0.00
Total Unselected Projects:	£6,668,246.00
Total of all Projects:	£31,668,246.00



Balanced Scorecard Summary

Scorecard Ranking

Scoring Summary

Weighted Scores

Final Ranking Summary

Proposed Project Prioritisation