

**Joint Executive Advisory Board – 8 January 2018**

**Supplementary Information Sheet (Pages 1 - 16)**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Joint Executive Advisory Board

8 January 2018

## Supplementary Information Sheet

### Item 5: Community Right to Bid

The List of Assets of Community Value registered with the Council is set out as Appendix 1 to this Sheet.

A List of Unsuccessful nominations for registration as an Asset of Community Value is set out in Appendix 2 to this Sheet.

### Item 6: Capital and Investment Strategy incorporating the General Fund Capital Programme and Prudential Indicators (2018-19 to 2021-22) and Treasury Management Annual Strategy Report (2018-19)

Substitute the Capital Expenditure Summary Table on pages 35 and 64 of the agenda with the Table below:

<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</b>	<b>2017-18 Approved £000</b>	<b>2017-18 Outturn £000</b>	<b>2018-19 Estimate £000</b>	<b>2019-20 Estimate £000</b>	<b>2020-21 Estimate £000</b>	<b>2021-22 Estimate £000</b>	<b>2022-23 Estimate £000</b>
<b>General Fund Capital Expenditure</b>							
- Main Programme	45,916	26,627	39,140	23,129	5,220	5,220	0
- Provisional schemes	51,850	2,773	43,460	83,003	66,970	45,762	51,774
- Schemes funded by reserves	1,573	3,316	2,302	537	537	0	0
- S106 Projects	440	602	0	0	0	0	0
- Affordable Housing (General Fund)	220	0	0	0	0	0	0
- New Bids (net cost)	0	0	7,125	47,994	35,105	400	5,550
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>99,999</b>	<b>33,318</b>	<b>92,027</b>	<b>154,663</b>	<b>107,832</b>	<b>51,382</b>	<b>57,324</b>
<b>Financed by :</b>							
Capital Receipts	(330)	(324)	(4,000)	(9,200)	(9,075)	(16,000)	0
Capital Grants/Contributions	(3,982)	(3,432)	(1,221)	(2,250)	(4,750)	(1,750)	0
Capital Reserves/Revenue	(7,973)	(9,371)	(13,980)	(757)	(757)	(220)	0
Borrowing	(87,714)	(20,192)	(72,826)	(142,456)	(93,250)	(33,412)	(57,324)
<b>Financing - Totals</b>	<b>(99,999)</b>	<b>(33,318)</b>	<b>(92,027)</b>	<b>(154,663)</b>	<b>(107,832)</b>	<b>(51,382)</b>	<b>(57,324)</b>
<b>Housing Revenue Account Capital Expenditure</b>							
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>21,970</b>	<b>9,172</b>	<b>21,186</b>	<b>25,145</b>	<b>11,475</b>	<b>5,975</b>	<b>6,975</b>
<b>Financed by :</b>							
- Capital Receipts	(4,974)	(1,623)	(5,113)	(6,151)	(2,050)	(400)	(700)
- Capital Reserves/Revenue	(16,996)	(7,548)	(16,073)	(18,994)	(9,425)	(5,575)	(6,275)
<b>Financing - Totals</b>	<b>(21,970)</b>	<b>(9,172)</b>	<b>(21,186)</b>	<b>(25,145)</b>	<b>(11,475)</b>	<b>(5,975)</b>	<b>(6,975)</b>

A bid for capital funding entitled “A331 Hotspots” was omitted from the agenda. A copy of the bid details is attached as Appendix 3 to this Sheet.

A schedule of comments from the Joint EAB Budget Task Group is set out as Appendix 4 to this Sheet.

### Item 8: General Fund Capital Programme Bid Nos. 97, 169, 261 and 268

Additional Information in respect of Bid No. 268 – Student Accommodation Investment is set out as Appendix 5 to this Sheet (Confidential)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Register of Successful Nominations

Successful Nominations					
Case Reference:	Title/Function of Property	Address:	Nominating Community Interest Group:	Date of Decision:	Updates:
002/14	Peaslake Village Stores	Peaslake Guildford RH3 7DE	Shere Parish Council	20 March 2014	Review decision issued on 4 September 2014. Original decision upheld but amendment made to name from "Peaslake Village Stores and Post Office" to "Peaslake Village Stores".
003/16	Electric Theatre	Onlow Street Guildford GU1 4SZ	Guildford Amateur Theatre Association (GATA)	18 January 2016	
005/16	The White Hart Public House	76 The Street Tongham Surrey GU10 1 HD	Uncorporated Body under section 5(1)(c) of the Regulations	21 September 2016	
006/16	The Boiler Room	13 Stoke Fields Guildford	Community Interest Company – The Boilerroom Originate CIC	21 September 2016	
008/16	The Cyder House Inn	Peper Harrow Lane Shackleford GU8 6AN	Shackleford Parish Council	21 September 2016	


## Register of Unsuccessful Nominations

Unsuccessful Nominations					
Case Reference:	Title/Function of Property:	Address:	Nominating Community Interest Group:	Date of Decision:	Reason Nomination Unsuccessful:
001/14	Land	Land south of Ash Lodge Drive, Ash	Ash Parish Council	20 March 2014	The use of the property away from the established footpaths was occasional and over part of the nominated land only and it therefore fails to meet the test in Section 88(1) of the Localism Act 2011
007/16	Three Farms Meadow	Ockham	Ockham Parish Council	24 January 2017	The application has not demonstrated an actual current or recent use of the building or other land that is not an ancillary use that furthers the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community presently or in the recent past as prescribed in Section 88(1) Localism Act 2011).
009/16	Guildford Railway Station	Station Approach	Unincorporated body	7 December 2016	The property is considered to fall within an excluded category





# Bid for Funding: A331 Hotspots



<b>Project Name:</b>	<input type="text" value="A331 Hotspots"/>		
<b>Project Code:</b>	<input type="text" value="2017"/>	<input type="text" value="111"/>	
<b>Project Description:</b>	<input type="text" value="Addressing two 'hotspots' or congestion on the A331: 1) The junction of the A331 with A31 a roundabout which suffers from queuing on the A31 and A331 during peaks. 2) The junction of the A331 with the A323 a grade-separated roundabout over the A323 which suffers from queuing at peaks and is likely to worsen giving forthcoming developments in the area."/>		
<b>Project / Programme Manager:</b>	<input type="text" value="Rob Curtis"/>	<b>Ward:</b>	<input type="text" value="Ash and South Tongham Ward"/>
<b>Senior Responsible Officer:</b>	<input type="text" value="Zac Ellwood"/>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<input type="text" value="Development"/>
<b>Corporate Plan Theme:</b>	<input type="text" value="Our Infrastructure"/>	<b>Confidential:</b>	<input type="text" value="No"/>
<b>Expected Start Date:</b>	<input type="text" value="23/07/2017"/>	<b>Exempt VAT Implications:</b>	<input type="text" value="No"/>
<b>Target Completion Date:</b>	<input type="text" value="30/06/2020"/>	<b>Grant access to someone:</b>	<input type="text"/>

**Drivers and Objectives:** Reduce congestion on key route into Guildford (A31) and A331/A323  
Improve Air Quality  
Improve Road Safety

**Background Information:** The A331/A31 roundabout junction at the southern end of the Blackwater Valley Road and the next junction to the north, a grade-separated interchange with A323, have long suffered capacity issues, particularly during weekday peak periods. This impacts the local roads but also creates queues from slip roads onto fast moving traffic lanes on A331 southbound and A31 westbound creating wider queuing and safety issues. These junctions have been identified in the traffic analysis for the Local Plan as being two of the short list of Hotspots to be addressed. As these are weekday peak period issues, it is proposed that peak hour part signalisation of these junctions is implemented as the main issues are imbalance of traffic flows which the current give-way arrangements are ineffective at providing a balanced reduced delay.

This scheme is part of the £12.5m bid to the EM3 LEP provisionally accepted under the 'Unlocking Guildford' transport package and this project is seeking 50% of the funding from the LEP with Guildford providing the match capital funding.

**Project / Programme Objectives:** The scheme will provide a quicker and more reliable journey time for vehicles exiting the A31 westbound to join the A331 and for all road users using the A331/A323 interchange. Significant residential development is proposed adjacent to the A323 which will result in a further exacerbation of traffic delays.

The improvements will provide safety benefits by reducing the incidence of slip-road traffic queuing back onto the A31 and A331.

The A331 has also been identified as an Air Quality hotspot and these works will assist in reducing air quality issues in the area.

**Implications:** Continued and worsening congestion on the A31, A323 and A331 together with associated negative impacts on air quality and the economy.

**Legal / Statutory Requirement:**

**Legislative / Statutory Implications:**

**Planning Permission Required:**

**Building Regulation Required:**

**Details of Other  
Required  
Consents:**

Working with Surrey County Council, they would need to approve of the plans as they are the highway authority.

**Constraints:**

Currently funding is being sought from EM3 LEP with match funding being provided by GBC. There is currently a limit of available funding which may not be enough to complete major changes on both roundabouts.

**Assumptions:**

Funding is available.

Current pre-feasibility plans indicate that there are viable options, though further feasibility work and information is required to test this in more detail.

There is some land take required and it is assumed that this can be completed within the budgetary constraints.

**Changes /  
Effects:**

Physical changes to both junctions:

A331/A323 currently has a "do minimum" option of amendment to lane marking to assist with lane selection. More significant changes are to be considered as part of the feasibility study which might include a "hamburger" type layout which segregates the main traffic flow from two adjoining minor roads. These measures will have the effect of decreasing delays and congestion, particularly on the major roads, thus reducing air quality issues and assisting in enabling future growth.

A331/A31 is likely to comprise new traffic signals on at least two of the arms of the roundabout. This will assist drivers leaving the A31 to travel north on the A323; currently there are long queues forming on this approach as the roundabout gives priority to those wishing to join the A31 and travel south. The result would be that the queue length reduces significantly, again improving air quality and reduce journey times. The signalisation will also make it possible to improve the existing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists at this location - there is currently an informal crossing which could be upgraded to a toucan crossing.

**Measures for  
Success:**

- Reduction in congestion (and reduction in journey times).
- Improvement in Air quality.
- Improved pedestrian/cyclist facilities - leading to increase in numbers using routes.
- To be further determined following feasibility.

**Viable Options  
and Rejection  
Reasons:**

In progress.

## Costs

Year	Description	Capital Value (£)	Revenue Code	Revenue Code Name	Revenue Value (£)
2018/19	Detailed design and procurement	150,000	N/A	N/A	
			N/A	N/A	0
2018/19	Land required to enable works	150,000	N/A	N/A	
			N/A	N/A	0
2019/20	Contractors	2,230,000	N/A	N/A	
			N/A	N/A	0
2020/21	Contractors	1,400,000	N/A	N/A	
			N/A	N/A	0

## Costs Totals

Year	Capital Total (£)	Revenue Total (£)
2018/19	£300,000	£0
2019/20	£2,230,000	£0
2020/21	£1,400,000	£0

## Financial Benefits

Year	Description	Capital Value (£)	Revenue Value (£)
2018/19	Funding awarded by the EM3 LEP (exact spend profile to be agreed with the EM3 LEP post business case submission)	300,000	0
2019/20	Funding awarded by the EM3 LEP (exact spend profile to be agreed with the EM3 LEP post business case submission)	1,665,000	0

## Financial Benefits Totals

Year	Capital Total (£)	Revenue Total (£)
2018/19	300,000	0
2019/20	1,665,000	0

## Non Financial Benefits

Title	Category	Measure	Expected Delivery Date
Reduced congestion	Improved Service Provision	Queue length Journey Times Air Quality	01/05/20

## Risks

Title	Description
-------	-------------

LEP not approving business case	If a suitable case for growth from the measures cannot be made, the EM3 LEP might not agree to fund the work. We are mitigating this by producing a strategic business case for the package of projects which will demonstrate the value of the projects ahead of submission of each individual business case.
No viable solution to solution can be found	Given the physical constraints there might be a position where the consultants are unable to identify a feasible design which gives the benefits required. Given work completed to date the likelihood of this risk materialising is very small.

## Fundamental Themes

<b>Our Economy:</b>	8 - Medium to High	The project enables growth in the area and in Rushmoor.
<b>Our Borough:</b>	6 - Medium	
<b>Our Infrastructure:</b>	10 - Very High	The project is an improvement to our existing infrastructure which needs to be upgraded to be able to cope with existing and future demands.
<b>Our Environment:</b>	8 - Medium to High	Reduced congestion, increased journey times and improved air quality are all expected from the project.
<b>Our Society:</b>	0 - None	
<b>Your Council:</b>	0 - None	
<b>Fundamental Themes Total:</b>	<b>32</b>	

## Other Category Themes

<b>Asset Management:</b>	0 - None	All works are on the public highway and so will be managed by the County Council once delivered.
<b>Business Case:</b>	8 - Medium to High	Business case is being compiled as part of the feasibility. It is expected that the business case will demonstrate a need for the project and an acceptable BCR.
<b>Health and Safety / Statutory Requirement:</b>	2 - Low	CDM regulations to be followed. This will assist with air quality and is likely to improve road safety on the junctions, however this has not yet been fully assessed.
<b>Service Delivery:</b>	8 - Medium to High	Delivery of the project would enable development to come forward and demonstrate to the LEP our commitment to growth whilst also improving access to/from the town
<b>Third Party Funding:</b>	10 - Very High	50% match expected from the EM3 LEP
<b>Other Themes Total:</b>	<b>28</b>	

**Themes Total:** **60**

## Comments from Joint EAB Budget Task Group (8 December 2017) on Capital Bids 2018-19

### Attendees

Councillors: Angela Gunning, Caroline Reeves, Colin Cross, David Quelch, David Reece, Nils Christiansen

<b>Bid</b>	<b>Bid title</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
97	Tyting farm land – removal of barns and concrete hardstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marked as Confidential</li> <li>• Support bid</li> <li>• Evidence to support costs?</li> </ul>	M. Appleton refers to page 1 of the Capital Bid – Under drivers and objectives – “The estimated costs of demolition of these barns is based on a known cost of a single barn that was demolished, which the Council previously sold to a third party in 2014 and subsequently demolished”.
111	A331 hotspots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bid</li> <li>• Are there any s106/developer contributions to help pay for the scheme?</li> </ul>	Discussions are ongoing regarding securing contributions from applicable local housing developments, through the planning process
129	Rodboro buildings – electric theatre through road and parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it necessary?</li> <li>• Expensive</li> <li>• Review alternative options</li> </ul>	<p>Required and urgent. Lots of complaints from tenants about the area.</p> <p>Reviewing alternative options would delay any project and would result in more complaints.</p> <p>Cost estimate based on a Tunsgate type scheme. Engineers could project manage in house.</p>
130	Castle grounds cottage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bid withdrawn</li> </ul>	n/a
139	Guildford bike share	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bid</li> <li>• Where did the sponsorship figure come from?</li> </ul>	<p>A high-level business case will be produced at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>Sponsorship opportunities will be identified by the chosen operator and will form part of the procurement process/contract</p>
145	48 Quarry St, Museum – structural works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
151	Guildford West – (Park Barn) station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bid</li> <li>• Review wording on the bid</li> </ul>	We will ensure that we reword the bid before it goes before Full Council to remove any references to either “social deprivation”, etc. or to the UTC.
169	Bus station relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bid</li> <li>• Marked as Confidential</li> </ul>	n/a

Bid	Bid title	Comment	Officer comment
197	Shawfield Day Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
198	SMP – electrical works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> <li>Will there be some income from allocating energy costs?</li> </ul>	
201	Millmead House - M&E plant renewal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
205	Hydro private wire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> <li>Review who can buy the electricity – would it be cheaper to be nearer properties</li> </ul>	
210	Stoke Park Masterplan enabling costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncomfortable with the bid – 4 years is a long time and a lot of money is being asked for</li> <li>Agree 18/19 budget only</li> </ul>	<p>To deliver the masterplan from feasibility to completion will take a number of years, realistically up to 10 years, and a significant amount of professional fees because of the nature of the works involved. This has to be set in context with procurement regulations and our constitution.</p> <p>The whole sum of money from feasibility to completion is being asked for in order for us to appoint an professional design team to ensure the project has continuity and multiple procurement exercises are not required to ensure this is delivered efficiently. The various stages, i.e feasibility, concept design, detailed design, implementation will then be called off in stages allowing us to control spend at every stage. The type of procurement cannot be entered in to unless the sum of money has been approved by the council and is part of our constitution.</p> <p>If we do not have the full design team with properly costed and detailed designs we will not be able to proceed with external funding applications.</p> <p>There will be multiple projects within this project for example and it is therefore important this is</p>

Bid	Bid title	Comment	Officer comment
			<p>co ordinated under one project/programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of an entire masterplan for the whole site, setting out a plan for the parks infrastructure,- paths buildings, sports pitches, car parks, drainage, sewers, power, water etc, this will also be costed and based on the recent consultation</li> <li>• Development of a new catering offer and building</li> <li>• Development of new play facilities</li> <li>• Restoration works to the listed historic fabric of the park – ha ha, walls, Japanese garden, tree avenues</li> <li>• Ensuring the park has a plan to link with the redevelopment of spectrum</li> <li>• Condition surveys and resultant works</li> </ul> <p>These projects need to go from feasibility through to completion in some areas with some works being essential.</p> <p>If just an 18/19 budget is agreed then the project will incur substantial delays because of creating further procurement exercises rather than actually getting on and delivering the project which is listed in the corporate plan. It is a large project for GBC containing many built and technical elements therefore it is important it is resourced properly to ensure it is delivered efficiently</p>
211	Roads and footpaths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the bid as a priority (18/19 onto the approved programme)</li> <li>• Will this be an annual budget in future?</li> </ul>	<p>There will be an element of this being an annual budget in the future but to a lesser amount, with repairs being managed from the parks operational reserve.</p>

Bid	Bid title	Comment	Officer comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why use tarmac? Alternative solution, e.g. crushed stone. Include comparative costs</li> </ul>	<p>Alternative solution will be used where appropriate however these are not normally suitable and more expensive in the long run as they have a shorter life cycle, higher annual maintenance for high traffic areas such as car parks and key access roads which are need to support events and activities on the park</p>
213	Sports pavilions – replace water heaters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
229	Millmead fish pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not supported by Lead Councillor for Finance</li> <li>• Generally supported by other Councillors, but not enough evidence to support the link between the fish pass and water quality</li> <li>• Would like more detail on whether this will truly open up the river</li> <li>• A lot of money – is it a priority?</li> <li>• Want to see evidence a fish pass works</li> </ul>	<p>Implementing the fish pass will support the following Corporate Plan priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•“Work towards developing continuous green and blue corridors through Guildford to improve residents access to nature and wildlife”</li> <li>•“Work with partners to provide and protect a high quality, diverse environment by ensuring sufficient and appropriate green, blue and open space and a resilient ecological network is maintained”</li> <li>•“Support the River Wey Catchment Management Partnership to improve the water quality of the river and the management of its catchment”</li> </ul> <p>The Wey Fish Pass and Wetland Delivery Project (Wey FWD) has been set up to deliver a set of priority projects, largely funded through Water Framework Directive Grant Aid. Local Authorities have a responsibility to help to achieve Water Framework Directive objectives.</p> <p>The primary aim of the removal of obstacles along the Wey is to improve the ecological resilience of the river. Together with other measures delivered by the Wey Landscape Partnership (the main one being the reduction of sources of diffuse pollution) the presence of a healthy fish population will improve the ecosystem within all levels of the food chain. In turn, this will enhance the self-cleaning ability of the river. The delivery of fish passes are an important part of a series of schemes that will improve the water quality in the Wey. It should be recognised that</p>



Bid	Bid title	Comment	Officer comment
			<p>individual schemes' success will be much greater in combination with others. The Environment Agency are actively working with a number of partners, including Thames Water, Affinity Water, Surrey Wildlife Trust and Borough Councils, to address water quality issues on the catchment.</p> <p>The fish pass at Millmead Island is part of the wider partnership project to reduce barriers of animal migration within the Wey under the Water Framework Directive. Not delivering the fish pass at Millmead Island will reduce the benefits of the other fish passes delivered by the other partners in the Wey Partnership as this obstacle to open up the River will remain. The timing of the projects seeks to maximise other funding opportunities. Over the next 2 years 6 fish passes are planned for construction on River Wey catchment (at Ham, Newark, Walsham, Broadmead, Burpham and Westbrook Mill). Designs are being drawn up for fish passes at a further 5 sites on the Wey, and there is a much larger programme of work in the pipeline. The Wey Landscape Partnership is taking a strategic approach to tackling fish pass problems on the river, and the works proposed at Millmead form an important component of this work.</p> <p>The EA have a lot of evidence from other sites that fish, of all species and size classes, readily use bypass channels to migrate up and down stream. The EA carry out monitoring works, in the form of electric fishing surveys, upon completion of fish pass projects. Fish (including chub, dace, barbel, roach, bullhead, gudgeon etc) are present in large numbers within the bypass channel just weeks after construction work is completed. Scientific research on this subject can be provided if necessary.</p> <p>The EA are strongly encouraged to construct a fish pass, under the Water Framework Directive, when they refurbish or replace a weir. The weir is being upgraded and the fish</p>

Bid	Bid title	Comment	Officer comment
			pass is being recommended as part of this scheme to meet the Directive, as it is more cost effective to implement whilst doing the upgrade.
261	Land to rear of 39-42 castle street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
264	Old Manor House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
255	Crematorium VAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does this impact the viability of the main scheme?</li> <li>Would like more context</li> </ul>	NPV re calculated and scheme is still viable
	Student Housing	Not presented at meeting	n/a
	Museum additional funding	Not presented at meeting	n/a
	Capital contingency fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual budget</li> </ul>	n/a
140	ICT renewals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
177	Deck Millbrook car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> <li>Adverse possession? Where?</li> </ul>	There are two very small slivers of land within the car park itself that presently remain unregistered – reason unknown. However, officers within the Major Projects Team are very confident that our pending claim for adverse possession will be successful.
181	New POF equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> <li>Will it be linked to wider smart city strategy?</li> </ul>	
194	Structural works to MSCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
200	PBDC – air source heat pump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
207	SMP – air source heat pump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a
212	Stoke Park nursery – air source heat pump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support bid</li> </ul>	n/a