

Name of CTB making the asset transfer request:	St David's Brass Band SCIO
Land to which this asset transfer request relate:	Vogrie Hall, 33 Vogrie Road, Gorebridge, EH23 4HH
Validation date:	11th October 2021
Date of assessment:	15th December 2021
Assessed by:	A Lang, G Cousin, M Inglis, J Venton & M Kenmure (in attendance R Irvine, L Thomson)

	Projects Objectives	Evidence	Assessment Score 1-5 (1-Weak, 5-Very Strong)
1	<p>Do the project objectives meet the Single Midlothian Plan objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the economic circumstances gap • Reduce the gap in learning outcomes • Reduce the gap in health outcomes • Reduce Carbon Emissions in Midlothian to net zero by 2030 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to contribute to reducing health and learning outcomes for those gaining qualifications and supports mental health and a sense of belonging • Potential to contribute to growing and allotment strategy • Place for other community groups to meet and offer new opportunities linked to the SMP priorities • Supports climate change in terms of embodied carbon • Supports volunteering which is an action of SMP • Most of reference band to impact on band but does highlight impact to other groups 	<p>4, 3, 4, 2, 2</p> <p>Collective score 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to outcomes but not explicitly in terms of the how • Music contributes to local people's educational attainment and other health and wellbeing aspects • Only 9 youth members • More detail on demand and how can be achieved would have been helpful • High level statements on wider use but more details would be beneficial 	
2	<p>Value to relevant authority in existing use of asset?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasibility and cost of relocation of services elsewhere • Potential revenue savings arising from transfer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £1,000 offered • Cost of repairs £537,493 estimated by Council • Grant funding attracted £75,000 and £200,000 • Worth building and land £100,000 minimum figure, 2 house plots demolish building • Demolition costs potentially • Benefit to other community groups • £3,600 rent and group pay utilities and insurance £725.38 (not paid when not occupying) • Sum insured £599,560 • Alternative rent sum would be increased however the council does not have the financial resource to bring the building 	<p>4, 4, 4, 4, 4</p> <p>Overall score 4</p>

		<p>back into use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apparent the repair and maintenance cost far exceed the potential income 	
3	Value for alternative use/redevelopment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not on SHIP • Limited use for redevelopment – size for 2 house plots if sold • £100,000 • No other alternative plans made for that site since expression of interest, has been explored for nursery provision but rejected and don't envisage for the future 	<p>3, 3, 3, 3, 3</p> <p>Overall total 3</p>
4	Value for proposed and other community benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of focus on the application on the band rather than wider community benefit • Support from wider community through consultation responses, indicative use from previous community users • Small financial element £1,000 purchase being offered • If group get asset they have ideas and generated initial support and principle in application to embody community benefits to wider groups • Analysis of non-duplication or competitiveness with other community organisations • 30 members 92/3 thirds from Midlothian • Noise consideration 	<p>3, 2, 2, 3, 3</p> <p>Overall score 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to ascertain a financial value on the level of community benefits • Value of volunteer new opportunities 	
5	<p>Level of community benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of community served • Nature of benefits to be delivered • Community need/demand for the services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brass band mixed age groups • Outside space • Live music • Sensory garden • Expressive arts groups space to present or perform • Recording studio • Job creation one caretaker • Local trades people employed to carryout repairs • Sense of pride and community spirit • Intergenerational opportunities • Limited information on support to address social inequalities • Geographically Gorebridge however open to Midlothian and Environs • Growing population in the Gorebridge area, other anchor orgs at capacity in terms of space • Attendance at Galas and other local events to perform • Volume of community benefits difficult to 	<p>3, 3, 3, 3,</p> <p>Overall total 3</p>

		ascertain in terms of numbers benefiting	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venue for children parties • 11 groups registered an interest 	
6	Likelihood that benefits will be delivered over a 5 year period <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strength of organisation • Sustainability of business plan/project • Sources and level of funding support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project manager in building industry member • Depute head teacher • Retail management experience • Sound experience • IT and data analysis experience • finance skills accountancy • Feasibility drawings secured • Solicitor will be engaged for legal transactions • 148 consultation responses 249 support signatures • 11 user groups interested in using hall • £200,000 anonymous donation, £50,000, £7431, £13,693 • Request for council to waive legal fees (unlikely that the council would waive their own legal fees as recharged to the department of the council) • For 8 years band covered their own heating and lighting costs and other associated running costs and small repairs. Approximately £6,000 per year estimated future costs £9,000 approx low 	4, 4, 3, 3, 3 Score overall 3

		<p>estimation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not see the £200,000 in the accounts, due diligence established the amount was £200,000 and evidence of them receiving it with a letter. Pg177 (charities aid foundation). The difference in Council estimation of repairs and organisation approx. £300,000 difference Limited evidence of business model and business plan Higher than envisaged running costs with increased use of the building Got the money to operate just now but costs could escalate and limited information on contingency 	
7	<p>Impact of project failure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To surrounding local environment To reputation of the parties To the service users'/relevant authority's objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of community spaces available Less community activity Hamper other organisations securing capital grants due to project reputational damage Potential for unfinished and unsafe building to be the result Reputational damage to the organisation or local authority for providing the assets if the community benefits aren't realised or the organisation cannot cope with additional financial burdens 	<p>3, 3, 2, 4, 2</p> <p>3 overall</p>

	7 Best Value themes	Evidence	Score 1-5 (1-Weak, 5-Very Strong)
8	Vision and Leadership – does the organisation have in place a clear vision and plan for what it will do to contribute to the delivery of improved outcomes for Scotland?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes arts centre and completing existing facilities and avoids duplication • Application clear objectives and detailed plan for refurbishment and consultation with community 	<p>4, 4, 4, 4, 4</p> <p>Collective score 4</p>
9	Effective Partnerships – does the organisation have a collaborative approach to the challenges that communities face?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes evidence of partnership working with other community anchor organisations, consultation with community, other orgs using building when in operation, become more involved in community activities for example Christmas lights. No formal community commitment from other organisation to pay rents. • While collaborating with 3 other orgs the focus is not on wider communities challenges it is on providing space primarily for their organisation and other community groups although some contribution to wider community benefits. 	<p>3, 3, 3, 3, 2</p> <p>Overall score 3</p>
10	Governance and Accountability – can the organisation demonstrate structure, policies and leadership behaviours?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes good track record of operating facility and appropriate expertise in terms of project and financial management in the group. • No evidence of any additional policies in place apart from constitution • PVGs for some members who are linked 	<p>3, 3, 3, 2, 4</p> <p>Overall score 3</p>

		<p>to youth work with band</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of business plan, which can reflect on the leadership behaviours. 	
11	Use of resources – how does the organisation demonstrate effective management of all resources to deliver on outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous experience of generating income to meet running costs but not large repairs No detailed business plan and forecast of rising costs Successful in securing grant applications Human resource staff and volunteers (limited) If employing (need to engagement with advice organisation for becoming employer). Landscaping costs not included for example 	<p>2, 3, 3, 2, 2 Overall score 2</p>
12	Performance management – does the organisation have robust arrangements in place to monitor and report on outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial monitoring skills in place Consultation skills evident More work would be required in terms of monitoring impact of its work on the wider community Not clear about the systems in place to monitor or report or assess impact on wider outcomes 	<p>3, 2,2, 2,2 Overall score a 2</p>
13	Sustainability – what is the organisation doing to contribute to sustainable development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refurbishment opposed to demolition and new building although limited information on carbon reduction measure to reduce climate change 	<p>2, 2, 1, 2, 2 Overall score 2</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research on less impact on climate if not a new build • Some increased insulation levels • Maybe included in building warrants if required • Depreciation of asset • Limited evidence of climate change impact • Redundant building currently, traditional method of construction 	
14	Equality – has the organisation taken consideration of an embedded equality issues into its strategy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a commitment and openness towards inclusion but lacks specific details of how it would be proactive in ensuring those from equality groups were encouraged to participate in activities and legislative requirements are met. • Wheel chair accessed included • See notes from equality engagements officer with ideas and suggestions for equality improvements • Policy development for operating a building and employing staff 	<p>2, 2, 3, 2, 2</p> <p>Overall score 2</p>
	Total		<p>40/70</p> <p>57% positive</p>

Recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation for panel to approve subject to robust business plan with updated cost of works due to changing conditions for example asbestos. • Work with equalities engagement officer to promote active targeting of those from protected characteristic groups and consider accessibility audit before finalise refurbishment. • Encourage consideration of climate reduction actions in the refurbishment • Legal costs would not be covered by the council therefore the council would still charge the organisation legal costs • Economic development burden • Develop appropriate policies relating to building operation and employing staff • Strengthen the monitoring and reporting of impact on service users and the wider community so they can know the difference they are making.
Conditions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land sale not permitted • Production of business plan prior to going to CMAG for ongoing operation and also increase of running and capital refurbishment costs • Redeveloped of property as detailed per application

Score	Overview of evidence
5, Very strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and financial arrangements are strong and sustainable • Best Value characteristics are evidenced throughout the overall approach • Related project benefits are very robust and demonstrate value for money
4, Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and financial arrangements are sound and sustainable • Best Value characteristics are in evidence in the proposal • Related projected benefits are demonstrated well and represent value for money
3, Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and financial arrangements are in place and acceptable • Best Value characteristics have been considered as part of the proposal • Related projected benefits are acceptable and could lead to value for money
2, Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and financial arrangements are weak • Best Value characteristics are not well demonstrated in the proposal • Related projected benefits are not based on robust information and demonstrate questionable value for money
1, Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and financial arrangements are poor

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is little evidence of Best Value characteristics in the proposal• Related projected benefits are ill defined and/or unrealistic and do not demonstrate value for money
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------