

Scoring of Bids received

Summary Table

Criteria	Horton Chapel Arts & Heritage Society		Oasis Church		Hindu Mauritian Sabha (UK) Limited		Cllr Omer Kokou-Tchri (HICD)	
	Score	Weighted score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
1. Use	5	30	4	24	3	18	2	12
2. Finance/ Delivery	4	32	4	32	3	24	2	16
3. Risk	4	16	5	20	4	16	1	4
4. Quality /Environment	5	10	4	8	3	6	4	8
Total Score	18		17		13		9	
Total Weighted Score Out of 100		88		84		64		40

Assessment Criteria

1. **Nature of proposed use (weighted to form 30% of the overall score).** Under this heading we will consider matters such as the following:
 - a. the proposed end use(s) of the building
 - b. the range of those uses,
 - c. how inclusive or exclusive the uses could be,
 - d. what engagement there has been with the public
 - e. the provision of novel facilities for the borough or locality (is a facility being proposed which does not currently exist within the borough)
 - f. the benefits for the community as a whole (considering the economic, social and environmental benefits).

Facilities which meet unmet demand and which will be widely available for use by the community, both in the locality and the wider area, will score more highly.

2. **Financial viability and deliverability (weighted to form 40% of the overall score).** Under this heading we will consider matters such as the following:
 - a. The level of subsidy required above £450,000 from the funding held by the Council.
 - b. The source of any other funding required and how certain this is.
 - c. The refurbishment programme proposed and how this has been costed.

- d. What assessment has been made of the ongoing running/ maintenance costs and how it is proposed that these will be funded.
- e. Whether any “purchase price” is proposed to be paid.

Whilst the minimal use of Council subsidy is preferred, bids will score most highly which indicate that a proposal is financially viable. Where an application for third party funding has been made, it will initially be assumed that such application would be successful – acceptance of the bid would then be conditional on funding being secured in a reasonable time (to be specified).

- 3. **The balance of risks (weighted to form 20% of the overall score).** Under this heading we will consider the likely balance of risks between the Council and the bidder, should the matter proceed. Under this heading we will consider matters such as the following:
 - a. The governance structure of the bidder – whether it will be an individual, company, registered charity or other form of entity.
 - b. The interest which the bidder proposes to acquire – freehold, leasehold etc.
 - c. The bidder’s proposals in respect of accessing the Council’s subsidy funding.

The proposal which best manages the assessed risks, and in respect of which the level of risk retained by or transferred to the Council is minimised, will score most highly.

- 4. **Quality /Environmental factors (weighted to form 10% of the overall score).** Under this heading we will consider such matters as:
 - a. The type/quality of materials proposed.
 - b. The proposed method of construction.

- c. Whether any features are proposed which will improve the environmental sustainability of the building, compared with previous uses and/or other comparable buildings in the area.

The proposal will score most highly which best preserves this listed building, whilst at the same time reduces the impact of the operation of the building on the environment.

Scoring Matrix

The above criteria have been scored in accordance with the table below, before the scores were then weighted in accordance with the percentages set out above to produce an overall score.

0	Completely fails to meet appropriate standard or does not provide a proposal.
1	Proposal significantly fails to meet the appropriate standard, contains significant shortcomings or is inconsistent with other proposals.
2	Proposal falls short of achieving appropriate standard in a number of identifiable respects.
3	Proposal meets the appropriate standard in several material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in others.
4	Proposal meets the appropriate standard in most material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in some.
5	Proposal meets the appropriate standard in all material respects.

Horton Chapel Arts & Heritage Society

Assessment Criteria	Assessment Comments
1	Detailed plans have been provided. These are supported by survey data, as well as liaison with local artists and others. The proposal involves providing a type of facility which does not currently exist in the Borough. It provides for a range of uses which are in furtherance of charitable aims. The use is fully inclusive.
2	Detailed costed refurbishment plans have been provided, together with a detailed and evidenced business plan. The proposal will require allocation of the full subsidy approved by committee. It is dependent on receipt of a Heritage Lottery Grant. Assuming such funding is made available, the proposal appears to be sound and financially viable.
3	The risks of proceeding would be fairly minimal. The governance structure of a charitable incorporated company, and the associated regulatory requirements, give strong assurance that, if the decision was taken to proceed, the project would be successfully delivered. The Society has already assembled an effective team with the capabilities to complete a project of this nature. Heritage Lottery Grant conditions would ensure that funds are spent appropriately, maximising the use of available funds.
4	Detailed proposals have been provided for the sensitive refurbishment of the Chapel, meeting high quality and environmental standards.

Oasis Church

Assessment Criteria	Assessment Comments
1	The primary use will be as a church. This is inherently exclusive, for the member of the church. However, the church is part of an existing organisation with a strong track record of providing facilities for the whole community. The use for a church centre is not a novel one for the borough, as there are several established churches in the borough, some of which have wider facilities available for community use.
2	The proposal was developed relatively late in the process and is therefore less detailed. It is likely that the full subsidy would be required. There is strong assurance that the organisation could obtain sufficient funding to undertake the project. If undertaken, there is, again, strong assurance that the proposal would be viable.
3	The risks of proceeding with this proposal would be minimal. The associate organisation has a strong current track record of delivering substantial property-related projects.
4	Whilst detailed proposal are not yet available, the organisation's track record gives strong assurance a that a quality and environmentally sensitive scheme would be implemented.

Hindu Mauritian Sabha (UK) Limited

Assessment Criteria	Assessment Comments
1	Again, the primary use will be an exclusive one for members of the Hindu Mauritian community in Epsom & Ewell and beyond. However, the organisation has a track record of engaging with the wider community, and proposes to continue that, should their bid succeed.
2	Funding for the proposal would be dependent in large part on voluntary donation from individuals. Whilst it is possible such funding would be forthcoming, the assumptions may be generous. At this point a detailed scheme has not been worked up, but the expectations as to the sort of funding required seem realistic. If the scheme was to proceed, it is considered likely to be viable.
3	The risks of proceeding would be fairly minimal. The organisation is well-established, and has operated successfully in the local area. Whilst it has not itself undertaken a project of this nature, it has the capabilities to assemble an effective team to do so.
4	Whilst detailed proposal are not yet available, the organisation is committed to produce a quality scheme to meet their requirements

Omer Kokou-Tchri (Horton International Creative & Design Centre – from “Epsom First”)

Assessment Criteria	Assessment Comments
1	The proposal is for a primarily commercial operation. As such, it would primarily be used for the exclusive use of those renting space. It would be a novel facility. The potential for community use is not clear, given the intended primary use.
2	The proposal does not anticipate use of any subsidy. However, little detail is given as to the likely source, beyond assertion as to the availability of private finance. The proposal seems highly speculative, and unrealistic in terms of the rents likely to be receivable for the activities/facilities proposed.
3	It would seem that the risks of proceeding with this proposal would remain significant, given the novel and speculative nature of what is proposed. It is not clear that an effective team is in place with the capability to undertake a project of this nature.
4	Whilst detailed proposal are not yet available, the bid is predicated on providing a high quality facility.