# Project Outline

**Project Reference: [HS1] / [Seq No ]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title :** | NBJ London PV |
| **Sponsor :** | Denise | **Date :** | 24.07.17 |

## Background

A strong relationship has developed with Neil Burke of NBJ through the foray into bio-fuel. He remains committed and we have been exploring the potential for a PV array on his newly commissioned roof, together with their existing office roof.

However, an installer suggested that connection offers may be more forthcoming at the moment and we therefore decided to approach WPD to see what offer we could secure. We have secured a 150kW offer with no grid strengthening costs

## Project Synopsis

We have approached NBJ to assess the acceptability of a ground mount system on their landscaped area. The board has discussed the proposal and given the opportunity for the installation to bolster their sustainability credentials with their customers they are happy to move ahead.

There is potential for a ground mount of 150kW, roof mounts on a new shed and the office of 30kW or a combination of the 2 to a maximum of 150kW

## Outline financials

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Income** | **Expenditure** |
| Capital cost + management, legal, planning |  | 160,000 |
| FiT PPA income See detailed spreadsheet |  |  |

## SWOT analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weakness** |
| Strong relationship with the hostHigh energy userGood grid connection offerStable FiT rate Existing CBS thereby minimising administration | Planning consent may be impeded by an objection from the Glider ClubReturns for investors may be lower than previous projectCommunity Fund restricted due to reduced FiT rate |
| **Oportunities** | **Threats** |
| There is potential for additional/other renewables as the site has planning consent for additional building workExcellent local PR opportunities | Unexpected changes to the Levy Control Framework and FiTsInability to agree a roof lease/PPA |

## Sustainability rating

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Comments** | **Score****-5 to 5** |
| **Social** | Local company, good opportunities for local promotion but community fund reduced due to lower FiT | 3 |
| **Economic** | Additional funding for HE management – 4% return to members | 3 |
| **Environmental** | Carbon savings 20 years 74,544 tonnes | 5 |

## Summary

PROs – Strong host organisation support, therefore not likely to see anything like the RSA withdrawal

NBJ is a relatively high energy user making the proposition attractive not only to them but to the CBS

CBS already established enabling reduced administration and a faster turnaround

No current impediments in terms of changes to the Levy Control Framework or FiTs

CONs - Planning may prove contentious but NBJ has had some degree of success with other planning application to which the Glider Club objected

Potentially reduced returns to investors and to the community fund.

## Project Status

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accepted/Rejected** |  | **Date :** |  |
| **Reason** |
| [A statement from the board as to why the project proposal was accepted/rejected] |