

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Replacement Vehicle Workshop Roof
Location	Vehicle Workshop, Woking Road Depot
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Alan Hazell
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	N/A
--	-----

1. Description of project

Asset Development provides maintenance to Operational Services property at Woking Road Depot.

Building 19-22 Woking Road Depot is the Vehicle Workshop covering 1350m². It provides space for vehicle storage and general vehicle maintenance.

The building is steel portal frame construction with brick, corrugated sheet asbestos cladding and corrugated sheet asbestos roof covering. A recent portfolio wide condition survey has highlighted the roof to be in a poor state of repair and in need of replacement. It is proposed to remove all asbestos products from the building and replace with a modern profiled metal sheet roofing and cladding system with new guttering, internal lighting and photovoltaic panels.

It is requested for this project to be put straight onto the approved capital programme

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12	01/02/2015
Contract works	3	01/08/2015

3. Justification for project

- To manage risk of asbestos exposure in Guildford Borough Council's non-residential properties.
- To provide a safe and comfortable environment for Guildford Borough Councils Staff to work in.
- To allow the building to continue to provide its intended function
- To provide a sustainable source of renewable energy for Operational Services.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

The eventual structural failure and collapse of the vehicle workshop and the possible release of asbestos in to the environment.

5. Options

Repair of the roof has been considered but does not represent a cost effective option in the long-term.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?	N/A		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	170					170
Consultants Fees	8					8
Salaries: Property Services	2					2
Salaries: Housing Services	0					0
Salaries: Engineers	0					0
Other Fees	0					0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	180	0	0	0	0	180
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Detailed knowledge					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Roof			25

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Clay Lane Link Road
Location	Land north of Slyfield Industrial Estate and south west of Clay Lane
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Chris Mansfield/ Gaurav Choksi
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Cllr Matt Furniss
---	-------------------

1. Description of project

The proposal is for a new link road between Slyfield Industrial Estate and Clay Lane. It is a strategic infrastructure commitment of the Council.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	20 months	October 2014
Contract works	12 months	May 2016

3. Justification for project

Slyfield Industrial Estate is at present served by a single road access on its western side. It is via a fairly convoluted route off the A320; a road which runs alongside residential areas. The single access road to the estate means that the traffic cannot circulate and pinch points at junction occur, as well as within the estate itself. This has resulted in queuing within the site, in particular for the Surrey County Council waste depot and on the A320 Woking Road. Traffic congestion and as result of which slow/unreliable journey times are often highlighted by the existing businesses as the main barrier to growth and expansion.

In addition, there is an acute shortage of industrial land and expansion space for high tech businesses in the area. Initial work has shown that there are opportunities for redevelopment and intensification within the industrial estate however; these are again constrained by traffic problems.

A new link road would create a second point of egress and access to the estate on its eastern side, off Clay Lane. It will assist in both the retention of the key local businesses whilst encouraging inward investment in to the estate from new businesses. A new road will reduce congestion on the existing access routes and allow for better vehicle circulation.

In all these respects, a link road between Slyfield Industrial Estate and Clay Lane is a strategic infrastructure need of the Borough. To this end, the proposed link road is identified within adopted Council strategies and emerging planning policy documents.

While the delivery of the Link Road does not fully guarantee the overall delivery of SARP, it is a crucial element in this jigsaw. Were Phase 2 of the Link Road to then come forward (and assuming that the proposals for SARP are proven to be viable), then the regeneration benefits would increase significantly.

It is requested to include the 2015-16 part of the bid straight in the approved capital programme

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Loss of existing businesses and jobs from the Slyfield Industrial Estate and borough

Failure to deliver economic growth and new jobs

5. Options

A series of route alignments have been developed during the analysis of route options linking the industrial estate with Clay Lane. These have emerged as the project team has discussed the options, sought advice from external stakeholders and understood the local environment in which the road will be constructed.

These routes have been assessed against a variety of criteria, including land ownership, meeting of key objectives, benefits of each option, engineering restrictions, Environmental impact, Transport impacts and indicative costs.

The preferred route would unlock the full potential of the industrial site, bringing the road in to the south of the estate would mean that, as well as the industrial estate, the potential retail site, the relocated depot and new businesses would have access to the link road and therefore the A3. This would create greater employment opportunities due to the enhanced links being in closer proximity to the A3. It will allow Surrey County Council community recycling centre/waste vehicles to access the proposed new waste site directly from the link road and separate from the internal Slyfield Industrial Estate circulation traffic.

Part of preferred route is in Thames Water ownership. Therefore a two stage approach to delivery is proposed.

- Stage 1 will be the link road from Clay Lane to the junction with Westfield Road, this will be on land all in the control of Guildford Borough Council.
- Stage 2 will be the link from Westfield Road to Moorfield Road, this will pass through land in Thames Water ownership.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?		Other consents will be required from various statutory agencies, utilities.	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees	100					100
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Construction of Road		7,340				7,340
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	100	7,340	0	0	0	7,440
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	We have received quotations from consultants covering their costs up to submission of planning application. High level costings for building of the new road have been provided by external professional consultants.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
LEP: Stage 2		1,005				1,005
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	1,005	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Based on the bid submitted to the LEP					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Road	DFT – Webtag Document	£7.3m	Minimum 60 years

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Slyfield Foundation Units Forecourts – Tarmacadam yard repairs
Location	Moorfield road, Guildford
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Alan Hazell
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

The Foundation Units support small businesses mainly associated with vehicle repairs. Areas of the yard are holding large puddles and not draining as the worn and subsided tarmacadam does not allow the rainwater to drain into the mains system. Worn tarmacadam levels are further deteriorating and oil dropping from vehicles has disintegrated the tarmacadam surface.

The tarmacadam surface will further deteriorate to such a degree that the base course and yard foundation will require replacement. The extra work will cost significantly more money in both construction costs and lost revenue owing to areas of the yard needing to be barriered and excavated. This will generate claims from the tenants due to them not being able to access their units.

PROJECT IS DEEMED ESSENTIAL AND AS SUCH IT IS REQUESTED FOR IT TO GO STRAIGHT ONTO THE APPROVED PROGRAMME

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	1	July 2015
Contract works	3	Aug 2015

3. Justification for project

The Foundation Units support small businesses mainly associated with vehicle repairs. Areas of the yard are holding large puddles and not draining as the worn and subsided tarmacadam does not allow the rainwater to drain into the mains system. Worn tarmacadam levels are further deteriorating and oil dropping from vehicles has disintegrated the tarmacadam surface.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

The tarmacadam surface will further deteriorate to such a degree that the base course and yard foundation will require replacement. The extra work will cost significantly more money in both construction costs and lost revenue owing to areas of the yard needing to be barriered and excavated. This will generate claims from the tenants due to them not being able to access their units.

5. Options

Local patching of the deteriorated and damaged areas will not prove cost effective.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	no	Building Regulations required?	no
Any other consent required?	no		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	25					25
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees	2					2
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	27	0	0	0	0	27
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate subject to detailed survey					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate based on single non intrusive visit to the property					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Published design life for construction materials		10 years

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 1 (A25 Woodbridge Road to A320 Woking Road)
Location	This scheme delivers a 1.24 kilometre high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route along the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath around Parsonage Watermeadows in Guildford. The scheme links the A25 Woodbridge Road to the A320 Woking Road.
Landowner	National Trust

Officer responsible for project	Barry Fagg
Service Unit responsible for project	Planning Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Cllr Matt Furniss
---	-------------------

<p>1. Description of project</p> <p>This scheme delivers a 1.24 kilometre high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route along the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath around Parsonage Watermeadows in Guildford. The scheme links the A25 Woodbridge Road to the A320 Woking Road.</p> <p>Taken together with the existing improved towpath, the scheme provides a continuous high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route between key trip generators and attractors, namely Guildford town centre, business, industrial and retail parks and estates, and the designated ‘priority place’ of Stoke ward. The scheme also improves the cycling and walking connection from the Stoke ward to the Stag Hill campus of the University of Surrey.</p> <p>This scheme – the Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 1 (A25 Woodbridge Road to A320 Woking Road), and Phases 2 and 3 which we propose to bring forward in the future, will contribute significantly towards realising walking and cycling networks linking residential areas to key locations in Guildford. This is a key recommendation of the long-term movement strategy to 2050 set out in the Guildford Town and Approaches Movement Study (GTAMS) (Arup, 2014).</p> <p>The project is considered to be ‘Important’.</p> <p>WE ARE REQUESTING THIS TO BE PLACED ON THE APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME BECAUSE WE HAVE BEEN AWARDED MONEY FROM THE LEP AND ALSO ARE USING SPA CONTRIBUTIONS</p>

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	3 months, given that detailed design drawings are agreed and ready to be issued for tender and are supported by a bill of quantities which has been costed. The National Trust is the landowner for the existing towpath and Guildford Borough Council is the landowner of the adjacent Parsonage Watermeadows SANG. The project will be delivered by Guildford Borough Council and the National Trust, working in partnership through a joint project board.	January 2015
Contract works	Less than 12 months	April 2015

3. Justification for project

This Bid for Funding will provide Guildford Borough Council's capital local contribution of £177,000 to the Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 1 (A25 Woodbridge Road to A320 Woking Road).

This capital local contribution is drawn from monies provided to the Council by Section 106 payments for SANG.

The capital local contribution of £177,000 will be supplemented by a funding allocation for £531,000 million from the Local Growth Fund, which is administered by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The total of £708,000 is the capital cost for the scheme.

The Corporate Plan (April 2013- March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.

This scheme delivers a 1.24 kilometre high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route along the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath around Parsonage Watermeadows in Guildford. The scheme links the A25 Woodbridge Road to the A320 Woking Road.

Taken together with the existing improved towpath, the scheme provides a continuous high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route between key trip generators and attractors, namely Guildford town centre, business, industrial and retail parks and estates, and the designated 'priority place' of Stoke ward. The scheme also improves the cycling and walking connection from the Stoke ward to the Stag Hill campus of the University of Surrey.

This scheme – the Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 1 (A25 Woodbridge Road to A320 Woking Road), and Phases 2 and 3 which we propose to bring forward in the future, will contribute significantly towards realising walking and cycling networks linking residential areas to key locations in Guildford. This is a key recommendation of the long-term movement strategy to 2050 set out in the Guildford Town and Approaches Movement Study (GTAMS) (Arup, 2014).

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the bid fails, the Council will not be able to deliver the scheme in 2015-16 as the funding from the Local Growth Fund, if awarded by the Enterprise M3 LEP, is contingent on local capital contribution being provided.

5. Options

There are no further viable options.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No.	Building Regulations required?	No.
Any other consent required?	No. The National Trust is the landowner of the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath and Guildford Borough Council is the landowner of the adjacent Parsonage Watermeadows SANG. Accordingly land ownership matters are settled which will facilitate the timely delivery of the scheme.		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	708					708
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Payment to Enterprise M3 LEP or their agent						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	708	0	0	0	0	708
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Detailed design drawings are agreed and ready to be issued for tender and are supported by a bill of quantities which has been costed.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106	177					177
Enterprise M3 LEP Local Growth Fund	531	0	0	0	0	531
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	708	0	0	0	0	708
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Detailed design drawings are agreed and ready to be issued for tender and are supported by a bill of quantities which has been costed. External funding is subject to a bid which is presently being considered by the Enterprise M3 LEP.					
S106 reference number if known	Various – pooled as part of SANG					

9. Expected useful life of the asset						
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given						
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)			
Component 1	1.24 kilometre high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route along the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath around Parsonage Watermeadows in Guildford	£708,000	15 years.			
Component 2						
10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income) (enter NIL if no implications)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	The towpath is a National Trust asset and the upgraded route will be maintained by the National Trust.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Replacement vehicle programme
Location	Woking road depot
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Chris Wheeler
Service Unit responsible for project	Operational Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

The Council has approximately 150 heavy and light commercial vehicles plus items of plant. All items have a limited life and require replacement. As replacement becomes necessary, justification will be made by the procuring manager and this in turn requires a further sign off by the Head of Service, Strategic Director and Management Team. The figures given in this bid are provisional and a report will be provided to the Executive before purchases are made.

Please note that in 2016-17, the bid rises to £2.6 million to allow for the purchase of five commercial waste freighters and five garden waste freighters which are known to cost in the region of £200,000 each, at today's prices. Please also note that commercial and garden waste operations were not included in the recent Recycling More project because that involved domestic collections only.

There is an approval process in place for purchasing the vehicles. Service managers prepare a justification form to the fleet manager, and Management Team approve the spend for each vehicle ordered.

IT IS REQUESTED TO PUT THE 2015-16 ELEMENT ONTO THE APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.		April 2015
Contract works		

3. Justification for project

Some vehicles are required for services to undertake statutory and regulatory functions, particularly those allocated to Waste Operations. Vehicles are absolutely necessary to enable the provision of Key Delivery Targets such as to reach a 70 per cent recycling rate. The new commercial fleet will also assist in meeting the priority within the Corporate Plan of "increasing the proportion of the Council's total income from commercial services".

Efficiencies are gained through procuring vehicles with the latest 'green' technologies currently Euro 6.

All new vehicles are warranted – a new vehicle requires considerably less maintenance and repair, and could result in revenue savings in terms of repairs.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Appropriate vehicles are required to perform the diverse range of services currently performed by the Council

5. Options

Alternative options are considered and justified for every vehicle and piece of equipment procured. Contract hire has been examined but the Council's ability to maintain vehicles at considerably less than public sector prices makes this an expensive option

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Other Fees						
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases	630	2,600	600	600	600	5,030
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	630	2,600	600	600	600	5,030
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	The estimate is based on anticipated costs for replacement vehicles. The requirement for £2.6 million in 2016-17 includes a requirement to renew the Council's five Commercial Freighters and five garden waste freighters which are currently known to cost in the region of £200,000 per vehicle. At that stage, these freighters will be eight years old and past a point of reliability. These costs are the total required.					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Vehicles			various
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Replacement boilers
Location	The Electric Theatre
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Amanda Hargreaves
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	n/a
--	-----

1. Description of project

The bid is for the replacement of the Theatre's boilers which are now 17 years old. We have three boilers and replacing them has been on the agenda for many years. We had one boiler fail last year (but it was possible to get it back up and running again). The boilers are rusting out, and it's difficult to know how long they're going to last. We would need to replace all three boilers at the same time.

We are investigating a Water Source Heat Pump (WSHP) solution that would mean water from the River Wey would be utilised to heat and cool the building. This is both economical in operation and environmentally friendly. This is currently in the feasibility stage and we're working with colleagues in Energy Management to take this further.

This project is Important, but will become Essential if the boilers fail.

IT IS REQUESTED THAT THIS PROJECT IS PLACED ON THE APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	20 weeks	April 2015
Contract works	4	August 2015

3. Justification for project

The boilers provide the Theatre with both heat and hot water. If the boilers fail, we could experience a loss of heating and hot water to the building. The loss of hot water will mean that the Theatre has to suspend operations in some areas (the Café Bar for example) and potentially lead to closure of the entire building, which will be disastrous for business. The loss of heating may be less of an issue, but all the same it's expected that visitors to the venue would be able to enjoy their visit in comfort and staff should be able to work in a workplace with appropriate temperatures (the HSE recommend over 16 degrees Celsius).

The company who service the boilers report back after their visits that they're becoming less reliable, with spare parts becoming harder to find.

Whilst this project doesn't feature in any Plans, it's a fundamental part of Theatre operation to ensure that customers are comfortable during their visit to us, that we comply with all relevant health and safety legislation and that we are able to provide a continued service in all areas to our customers.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If this bid was unsuccessful, it is likely that if the boilers breakdown, an interim solution will be needed (with possible closure in some areas), along with replacement boilers and there would then be an unplanned cost and workload to the Council.

5. Options

The options are direct 'like for like' replacement of boilers (i.e. gas boilers) or replacing them with WSHP technology, but there aren't any alternative solutions beyond this.

We are investigating the possibility of a SALIX bid, perhaps making use of energy from the River Wey/alternative sources, however this is in its very early stages. Even if this was an alternative way forward, we will still need the backup of the boilers, and could not just rely on the hydro electric pump. This would be complementary to the boilers, and would not be sufficient in isolation. **(Please see bid 26)**

There are no alternatives beyond the SALIX option.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	TBC	Building Regulations required?	TBC
Any other consent required?	TBC		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	110					110
Consultants Fees	9					9
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees	1					1
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	120	0	0	0	0	120
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	The estimate is based on advice from the Electrical and Mechanical Services Manager. Alternatively, this amount would contribute to the WSHP technology if it proves feasible.					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Existing boilers are approx. 18 years old and spare parts are now becoming difficult to source.	110	15
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs	0	2	2	2	2	10
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	2	2	2	2	10
Please provide further details:	Other costs - £2,000 per year maintenance					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Flood resilience measures
Location	Various locations throughout the borough but mainly William Road area and Walnut Tree Close
Landowner	Various

Officer responsible for project	Tim Pilsbury
Service Unit responsible for project	Environment

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Councillor Richard Billington
---	-------------------------------

1. Description of project

Guildford town centre and other parts of the borough experienced flooding because of severe weather conditions in December and January 2013-14. A number of domestic properties and businesses in various locations were affected by flooding. The situation, especially on Christmas Eve, was made worse by the loss of power that resulted in traffic light failure and the subsequent widespread congestion in the town centre.

This funding is requested for the purchase of temporary flood defences or a contribution to a more permanent flood defence scheme that would be undertaken by the Environment Agency, subject to a further report to the Executive.

IT IS REQUESTED FOR THIS BID TO BE PLACED ONTO THE APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	1	April 2015
Contract works	NA	NA

3. Justification for project

The Customer and Community Scrutiny Committee at the meeting on 15 July 2014 agreed that a capital bid be submitted for funding of £100,000 for temporary flood defences or as a contribution to a larger flood defence scheme to be promoted by the Environment Agency. This was confirmed by the Executive on 30 September 2014.

During the flooding over the Christmas/New Year period 2013-14 it became evident that we were totally reliant on sandbags as flood defences. While sandbags are reasonably useful as flood defences there are other products on the market that are more easily deployable such as gel filled bags which expand on contact with water or temporary flood barriers.

This fits in with the Corporate Plan themes of Economy and Society by enabling businesses and residents to be more resilient in times of flooding.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If funding was not made available it could impede the Council's ability to respond to flooding situations as occurred over the Christmas/New Year period 2013-14.

5. Options

The only other option is to do nothing, but the Council would then be failing in its duty of care.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments						
Consultants Fees						
Salaries: Property Services						
Salaries: Housing Services						
Salaries: Engineers						
Other Fees						
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases	100					100
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	100	0	0	0	0	100
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate figures.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	No external funding identified.					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1 (works identified from specification)	Best guess. Temporary flood defences could last 10 years. A contribution to a more permanent scheme could last for 20 years.	100,000	10
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Any cost can be met by existing budgets.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Replacement Roundabout Planters
Location	Stoke Park
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Paul Stacey
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

Replacement Roundabout Planters.

We manage roundabouts on behalf of Surrey County Council in partnership with Marketing Force who seeks sponsors and arrange advertising. We are responsible for both the soft and hard landscape under the agreement. The sponsorship pays for the maintenance of the roundabouts.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	0	
Contract works	1	04/15

3. Justification for project

We currently receive £46,000 per annum through sponsorship of the roundabouts. This figure has reduced significantly due to sponsors refusing to renew their contract or pulling out of existing contracts due to the poor standard of existing roundabouts. Expenditure to develop the roundabouts would result in preserving existing income and generate additional minimum income of £9,000 through new sponsors. These improvement will enable resources to be targeted effectively creating lower maintenance landscapes or having planters with watering reservoirs to reduce the watering demand and improve the quality of the schemes

Holly Lane = £10,200 for planting up this does not include woodchip or traffic management.

Holly Lane = £8,500 for planting as original spec with gravel in the centre this does not include traffic management

Dennis roundabout £9,950 for the two island beds, these will have 3 stone monoliths in each surrounded by Blue slate.

Lido roundabout =£4,400 - This include 3 stone flat faced monolith with a hole going through approx 48" high surrounded will green slate

Shalford roundabout = £2,250 - To supply 4 square recycled plastic planters.

Woodbridge road/ Stocton road roundabout £2,250 - To supply 4 Square recycled plastic planters

Rydes Hill roundabout £1,800 for 3 Square recycled plastic planters

Cumberland avenue roundabout £1,800 for 3 Square recycled plastic planters.

Remaining roundabouts – we will require 20 planters at £380 each – totalling £7,600

REQUEST THAT THIS BID IS MOVED ON TO THE APPROVED CAPTIAL PROGRAMME

4. Implications if project not undertaken
Loss of sponsorship, and operational hazards

5. Options
N/A

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?			

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Other (materials)	50	0	0	0	0	50
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	50	0	0	0	0	50
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Quotations – material as specified					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Roundabouts are already sponsored					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1			
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income	(9)	0	0	0	0	(9)
Net additional expenditure/(income)	(9)	0	0	0	0	(9)
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Stoke Park Glasshouses – thermal shading system
Location	Stoke Park
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Paul Stacey
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

Repairs to greenhouse shading to keep the asset functional and safe to deliver the towns floral displays

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	0	
Contract works	1	04/15

3. Justification for project**Glass houses one and two**

One off cost to replace the automatic thermal shading system £26,000.

The glasshouses are currently used to produce our hanging baskets, troughs and to grow on, the plants for our floral displays. Christ's college and Oak Leaf ¹also use them and there is a potential for the glasshouses to be utilised by Social Enterprise. We will be providing a service to Ash Parish Council by planting and maintaining their hanging baskets until they are ready to go out in late spring/early summer.

If the works are not completed the glasshouses will have to be closed as they are unsafe to use as several restraining wires for the shading mechanism have snapped causing additional structural damage to the shading mechanisms and ventilation systems.

442 troughs and baskets are planted in the glasshouses, if we were to decommission the glasshouses, this would be very expensive and we would need to buy in the plants which will have an on-going revenue requirement.

They also provide winter storage for the parks machinery as there are no purpose built sheds or facilities for the fleet or plant.

REQUEST THAT THIS BID IS PLACED ON TO THE APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME

4. Implications if project not undertaken

We will not be addressing mitigations in our risk assessments or providing a safe working environment or be able to provide floral displays

5. Options

N/A

¹ They use our facilities for classes and teaching horticulture, we provide regular occasional sessions teaching horticulture and then some come through on to our apprenticeship scheme into full employment so it helps us to address a national skills shortage in Horticulture.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?			

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	26					26
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
Other (please state)	26					26
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	26	0	0	0	0	26
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Quotation					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset				
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given				
	Basis of Estimate		Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Glasshouses		200,000	25
Component 2				

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Replacing the Theatre's projector and screen
Location	The Electric Theatre
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Amanda Hargreaves
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	n/a
--	-----

1. Description of project

This project is to replace the Theatre's projector and screen. It is an important project to press ahead with in order to maintain high standards in this area.

IT IS REQUESTED FOR THIS BID TO BE PLACED ON THE APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	0.5	01.04.15
Contract works	0.5	01.04.15

3. Justification for project

The Theatre's projector is at least 10 years old, the bulbs are not lasting the requisite number of hours and need to be replaced more frequently (costing between £150 and £320 each time), and the image quality is no longer what film audiences expect. The projector is not HD and its 4:3 format isn't compatible with wide screen film projection (which most films are in nowadays). The Theatre's sound system was upgraded to surround sound 7.1 a couple of years ago, and an upgrade in projector and screen would be the final part of that process.

The Theatre relies heavily on the use of the screen and projector for Film Festivals (covering up to 6 weeks per year) as well as our weekly Church booking and corporate events.

Upgrading the projector will necessitate the upgrade of the screen to ensure that it is compatible with wide screen format. We would look to replace with a motorised screen which would make it easier to do one off events, and decrease turnaround time for the installation therefore making staffing more efficient.

The screen and projector are hired out to organisations who request to use them (at £64 + VAT for the projector and £62 + VAT for the screen). This means that there will be some return on the investment in the new equipment. As the new projector / screen will have a higher specification the hire fees will be reviewed, and potentially increased, to reflect this change.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the projector breaks and is irreparable, then we will need to make this purchase anyway. As an interim measure we may need to hire in a suitable projector and screen which will be additional expenditure. Both will then be unplanned expenditure, and may result in disruptive changes to events or even cancellations and further loss of income / credibility for the Theatre.

5. Options

There are no other options.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	14					14
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Installation (in house)	1					1
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	15	0	0	0	0	15
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Based on quotation.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1			
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						
Other costs						
Less additional income	(2.5)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(12.5)
Net additional expenditure/(income)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(12.5)
Please provide further details:	For 2013-14 we received just over £3,000 of equipment hire income, which includes the projector / screen, so going forwards this is an estimate of £2,500 per year in equipment hire income					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Bay Construction at Stoke Cemetery
Location	Stoke Cemetery Stoughton Road
Landowner	GBC

Officer responsible for project	Natasha Precious
Service Unit responsible for project	Bereavement (Parks and Lesiure)

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	N/A
--	-----

1. Description of project

To clear area, sieve waste and construct relevant bays in stoke cemetery for soil, recycled composts and top soil (for the digging and backfilling of graves).

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	1	June 2015
Contract works	2	August 2015

3. Justification for project

Currently the soil deposit area at Stoke Cemetery consists of a grassed area on which all old soil, newly purchased top soil and waste matter is dumped. The project will enable the clearing of the area and the construction of screened bays to house the different soil and waste types.

IT IS REQUESTED FOR THIS BID TO GO STRAIGHT ONTO THE APPROVED PROGRAMME

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Complaints from stakeholders will increase regarding the aesthetic issues with the current arrangements. Due to inadequate storage and housing of material, the cemetery workers cannot recycle and utilise materials very efficiently, it has been highlighted in the Green flag judging report that this improvement should be made.

5. Options

Cemetery team have attempted to clear area in the past but does require appropriate foundations and screening which has proved impossible to do inhouse. No other area in the cemetery is viable as a waste area as the cemetery is already very low on available gravespace.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required? No
Any other consent required?	No	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Other (please state)	15					15
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	15	0	0	0	0	15
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Based on approximate quote from contractor depending on the exact square footage of the area we will need.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Screens/ fencing	3000	10-15 years
Component 2	Concrete	12,000	10-15 years

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Salix Energy Efficiency Projects
Location	Various locations at GBC operations
Landowner	GBC

Officer responsible for project	Chris Reynolds
Service Unit responsible for project	Corporate Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Matt Furniss
--	--------------

1. Description of project

This capital bid relates to funds already available through Salix funding initiative and already held in the Salix account.

It is planned to use the available Salix funds during 2015-16 on energy efficiency projects, substantially LED lighting at key GBC operational sites including Woking Road Depot and the Crematorium. These projects should achieve a 30% saving in energy costs, and consequent carbon allowance costs each year following installation. Payback has thus been established at four years.

Additional benefits from these projects will include reduced maintenance costs (the new equipment will have a longer lifespan) and a lowered health and safety risk (increased frequency of replacement).

The projects are classed as important, but deliver a substantial payback so provide a net financial gain after four years.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	3	April 2015
Contract works	2	September 2015

3. Justification for project

The scheme should go ahead because it provides:-

- carbon savings
- long term financial savings with a good payback on capital
- additional savings in carbon allowance costs
- reduced reported carbon foot-print
- improved reputation
- consequential savings in maintenance costs
- consequential reduced H&S risk

The scheme directly supports “promoting sustainability”, “reduced energy consumption”, “protecting our environment”

The projected value of energy savings as a result of this project are detailed in table 10.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Higher energy and carbon costs now and in the future.

5. Options

The projects are carefully considered to give maximum benefit based on carbon savings and financial payback.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	70					70
Consultants Fees	0					0
Salaries: Property Services	0					0
Salaries: Housing Services	0					0
Salaries: Engineers	0					0
Other Fees	0					0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases	0					0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	70	0	0	0	0	70
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate based on experience of similar schemes already implemented.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Equipment	70,000	15
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						
Other costs		18	18	18	16	70
Less additional income		(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)	(72)
Net additional expenditure/(income)		0	0	0	(2)	(2)
Please provide further details:	The income savings are a conservative estimate based on energy savings alone. Lower CRC, maintenance or H&S costs have not been quantified. The costs shown are the amounts needed to pay back the capital expenditure to the Salix account. Savings continue to accrue once the capital is paid back and this is reflected in the net saving shown in 2019-20.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Car Park Lighting upgrade
Location	Castle, Farnham and York Road MSCPs
Landowner	

Officer responsible for project	Kevin McKee
Service Unit responsible for project	

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

To upgrade the lighting in York Road, Farnham Road and Castle Car Parks to LED lights to reduce energy consumption and reduce costs. The project is important if the council is to reduce its carbon footprint and reduce costs. The current lighting is adequate but the new lighting with LED will reduce maintenance costs and energy costs. This is based on the experience of relighting Bedford Road multi-storey car park.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	6 months	October 2015
Contract works	6 months	June 2016

3. Justification for project.

The project is estimated to save around £45,000 per annum in electricity and maintenance costs once the new lights are in place.

4. Implications if project not undertaken.

The savings will not be realised

5. Options.

To continue as now and incur the additional costs.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	250					250
Consultants Fees	25					25
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services	25					25
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	300	0	0	0	0	300
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	The contractor cost is based on previous tenders the other costs are estimates. It is requested that the money be taken from the car park maintenance reserve.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1 LED lamp			5
Component 2 Fittings			10

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs		45				45
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	45	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	The saving will be made in electricity and a smaller amount in maintenance/replacing bulbs.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Affordable housing: enabling, site preparation and grants
Location	Various sites
Landowner	Various

Officer responsible for project	Nick Molyneux, Housing Development Manager
Service Unit responsible for project	Housing Advice

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Sarah Creedy
--	--------------

1. Description of project

This bid relates to proposed expenditure on the enabling of affordable housing in the borough, including site preparation and grants for affordable housing.

Council-owned sites

When a definite decision has been made for the Council to directly develop a site, preparation costs shift to the HRA. On sites where initial planning and feasibility work is being carried out and it may still be an option to dispose of the site to a housing association, costs will be met by this General Fund budget.

Site preparation costs

Costs for site preparation can include:

- Valuations
- Decommissioning costs
- Home loss and disturbance payments (although we do not anticipate any further Home loss costs in the coming two years other than those already identified in relation to Lakeside Close and New Road, Gomshall)
- Other costs relating to rehousing tenants
- Architectural services
- Planning fees
- Legal fees (for example sale agreements, nomination agreements, development agreements, easements)
- Site surveys, including topographical, ground investigation, ecological

Grant funding

Affordable Rents have been introduced which contribute to scheme viability. In addition, some Council-owned sites are being developed directly, removing the need to grant fund housing associations to do so. We therefore expect the amount of grant funding to housing associations to remain low. Grant agreed in previous years has now been paid out.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	Ongoing	Ongoing
Contract works	n/a	n/a

3. Justification for project

It is a Key Delivery Target of the council to enable the provision of affordable homes to address identified needs.

The Corporate Plan includes amongst its priorities to enable the development of more affordable housing across the borough through direct Council provision, housing associations and developers. It

includes a target of 120 new affordable homes provided through our partners by March 2016, as well as 80 new Council homes.

The SHMA, housing needs survey, and the figures from our housing register, demonstrate that there is a need for affordable housing of all sizes and types in the borough. Responses to the Local Plan consultation have shown that there is a high level of support for new affordable housing in the borough – even those who are opposed to housing development generally accept that there is a need for affordable housing to meet local needs.

The Economic Strategy 2013 – 2031 and the recent Regeneris housing study by the M3 LEP both highlight the need for affordable housing to ensure a healthy economy, with affordability of housing being directly linked to recruitment and retention issues, particularly for young people and other lower paid workers. Lack of suitable housing locally also influences commuting patterns, with many Guildford workers living outside the borough – a phenomenon which adds to traffic congestion and conflicts with our aim to be a self-sustaining economy.

The proposed enabling programme identifies ways of delivering affordable housing, either by supporting the HRA development programme, or by assisting other developers with grant funding or for affordable housing enabling works where schemes are otherwise unviable. Grant funding can also be of assistance in ensuring that our guidance on Affordable Rents is followed, in cases where charging less than the maximum allowable rent puts viability into question.

The Housing Advice Service Plan and the Draft Housing Strategy 2015-20 set out our intention to

- increase the delivery of affordable homes
- minimise homelessness in the borough
- make best use of existing homes (provision of new homes facilitates moves from under-occupied homes)

The proposed programme supports all of the above aims.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the project is not undertaken, it would have a detrimental effect on levels of homelessness, at a time when there is already upward pressure on numbers of people at risk of homelessness due to welfare reform and the state of the economy generally. There is an associated cost from increased reliance on temporary/bed and breakfast accommodation if we are unable to accommodate applicants to whom we have a statutory homelessness duty.

Failure to provide new affordable housing will mean that we will not keep pace with the loss of affordable homes via the Right to Buy. Furthermore, we are required to spend Right to Buy 1-4-1 receipts on affordable housing within a fixed timescale or risk returning some or all of them to central Government, therefore it is essential that we identify ways of funding new affordable housing.

There is an expectation within the local community that the Council will enable and deliver affordable housing, and this is reflected in the aims of the new Corporate Plan.

The housing options for people on low incomes in the borough are very limited, and failure to pursue this programme would further reduce their options.

There are negative effects on the local economy of a failure to enable and provide affordable housing, which have been noted above.

5. Options

The Council, as the strategic housing authority, and a major landowner in the borough, is the only organisation in the position of being able to enable affordable housing in this way.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	n/a	Building Regulations required?	n/a
Any other consent required?	n/a		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Ladymead (Fire Station)	10	5	5	0	0	20
Infill/Garage sites	50	20	20	20	20	130
Corporation Club, Slyfield	65	30	0	0	0	95
Guildford Park Car Park	240	30	0	0	0	270
General site preparation/feasibility	40	40	40	40	40	200
General grants to RPs/Empty Homes/Acquisition of properties	350	350	350	350	350	1,750
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	755	475	415	410	410	2,465
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	<p>Costs for Ladymead (Fire Station) and Corporation Club, Slyfield are based on lump sum fee quotes from consultants, and a small amount estimated for additional surveys as required for Planning.</p> <p>Guildford Park costs are based on a lump sum fee but the timing of the costs is uncertain. We originally envisaged that we would spend the bulk of the £240,000 in this financial year (2014-15) but it is now likely that most will be in 2015-16. The amount quoted includes work relating to the car park, as it is difficult to separate this from the housing element, given that the location and design of the car park is part of an overall plan for the site.</p> <p>The remainder of the bids are estimates.</p> <p>Most costs incurred after Planning Permission will be met by HRA budgets, so are not included here. Ladymead already has planning; some survey costs remain.</p> <p>We are less likely to need to grant fund RPs now that they can fund development via Affordable Rents, and now that we have the ability to acquire S106 or other units ourselves, which may be better value.</p> <p>£350,000 per annum has been included for grants to RPs to bring forward sites or enable special needs provision, and/or grants to refurbish or acquire properties (to bring empty homes back into use). If funds are spent on refurbishment or acquisition of properties, there will be a subsequent return either from repayment of grants to owners, from a rental income, or from resale of properties.</p>					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	<p>We are an HCA investment partner, however it is not possible at this stage to predict the levels of grant from 2015-16 onwards.</p> <p>This year we have received £425,000 in HCA grant towards our new build properties, and we will receive a further £425,000 on completion in March 2015. We are also due to receive £432,000 in grant towards the Ash Bridge Gypsy and Traveller pitches which will complete in this financial year. However HCA will not commit to grant funding for our future programme until there is more certainty regarding planning permission.</p> <p>We are in discussion with HCA regarding several sites, in particular Guildford Park Car Park. However it may not be advantageous to apply for HCA funding on all or any units on that site because we would not be able to combine it with spending of our Right to Buy 1-4-1 receipts, which must be spent by a certain date or else be returned to Government.</p> <p>Another possible source of funding, which is similarly difficult to quantify, is the receipt of payments in lieu of affordable housing from S106 sites where it is not feasible or viable to provide units on site. There may be cases where a developer is able to prove that a payment in lieu is the best option, however we would only accept this a last resort due to the difficulty in finding land for development on which to spend the receipts.</p>					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	n/a	n/a	n/a
Component 2	n/a	n/a	n/a

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	GBC Invest to Save Energy Projects
Location	Various locations at GBC operations
Landowner	GBC

Officer responsible for project	Chris Reynolds
Service Unit responsible for project	Corporate Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Matt Furniss
--	--------------

1. Description of project

This capital bid relates to funds already available through Invest to Save funding initiative and already held in the Invest to Save account.

It is planned to use the available Invest to Save funds during 2015-16 on photovoltaic and energy efficiency projects to provide reduced energy demand and increased energy production e.g. at Millmead and social housing sites. These projects should achieve an average of 20% annual payback through reduced energy cost, reduced carbon allowance cost, increased energy income from Feed-in-tariff and energy sale. Payback has been estimated at 5 years.

The projects are classed as important, but deliver a substantial payback so provide a net financial gain from year 6 onwards. They additionally provide greater resilience against the impacts of the “energy crunch” which is likely to cause blackouts over the next 5 years (especially if economic growth continues and upward path), and also improved sustainability and reputational benefits.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	3	Aug 2015
Contract works	5	November 2015

3. Justification for project

The scheme should go ahead because it provides:-

- carbon savings
- long term financial savings with a good payback on capital
- additional savings in carbon allowance costs
- reduced reported carbon foot-print
- improved reputation
- local generation of electricity provides better resilience in the face of the UK not being able to meet demand through centralised supply.

The scheme directly supports “promoting sustainability”, “reduced energy consumption”, “protecting our environment”

The projected value of energy savings as a result of this project are detailed in table 10.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Higher energy and carbon costs now and in the future. Poorer reputation for GBC.

5. Options

The projects are carefully considered to give maximum benefit based on carbon savings and financial payback.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Possibly	Building Regulations required?	Possibly
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	100					100
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	100	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate based on experience of similar schemes already implemented.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Equipment	100,000	15
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						
Other costs	5	20	20	20	20	85
Less additional income	(5)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(85)
Net additional expenditure/(income) (enter NIL if no implications)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Income shown is the payback generated from reduced energy and carbon costs and increased income from energy generation (Feed in Tariff and any export of electricity). This needs to be paid back to the Invest to save account to cover the capital outlay and this is shown in the "other costs" line above. Once the project has been repaid (average five years), there will be an ongoing revenue saving.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Housing Renewal and Disabled Facilities Grants
Location	Private homes throughout the borough
Landowner	Private owners, tenants and some social landlords

Officer responsible for project	Ted Wainhouse
Service Unit responsible for project	Health and Community Care Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Sarah Creedy
--	--------------

1. Description of project

The project is a programme to deliver a range of grants (mandatory for adaptations or discretionary for other works) and loans to private householders through the councils home improvement assistance scheme: The funds are used to pay for works to improve, repair or adapt individual homes and take account of the councils agreed policies and eligibility requirements for applicants.

The mandatory grant policy follows national guidelines whereas discretionary support is determined by the borough. Evidence to support the discretionary policy was obtained from a house condition survey carried out in 2009. This survey identified that there is an underlying problem with an ageing private sector housing stock occupied by low income households. This information has been utilised to influence the priorities in the home improvement policy.

The headline results from this survey identified that

- 16,000 dwellings (32.3%) can be classified non decent, which is similar to the national average for England of 31.5% in 2009.
- 8,700 dwellings (17.5%) have a Category 1 hazard present. This figure is below the 22% found nationally in the 2009 English Housing Survey.
- 26% of households have an income of less than £15,000 per annum
- 12% households are likely to be in fuel poverty 26%

Details of the survey can be found at

<http://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/7520/Private-Sector-House-Condition-Survey>

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	N/A	
Contract works		

3. Justification for project

We have an obligation under the Regulatory Reform Order 2002 to publish a policy setting out the assistance that would be given to support housing renewal in the area. The current home improvement policy, with its subsequent revisions, encompasses a range of innovative support for private householders. The policy aims to improve housing standards, eliminate health hazards and make homes decent. Part of the policy helps owners to return long term empty homes back in to use.

There is a statutory responsibility under the Housing Grants Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 to administer Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) in the area. These grants are mandatory and provide for the adaptation of homes for the benefit of disabled people whether they are owner occupiers, private, social or RSL tenants. We do receive a government grant of approximately £250,000 to defray some of the costs in respect of the DFG.

The programme meets the objectives in the Corporate Plan in respect of improving the lives of vulnerable groups, the provision of affordable homes and promoting sustainability.

The programme provides a diverse range of assistance the details of which are published in the policy. The key objectives seek to:

- adapt homes to make them suitable for disabled occupiers or members of their family
- assist vulnerable, elderly and disable people to live safely securely and independently.
- deal with category 1 hazards and to make homes decent
- tackle fuel poverty and to reduce carbon emissions
- bring long term empty homes in to use.

Discretionary assistance is by way of grant or loan and conditions attached to grants enable much of the outlay to be recovered, which makes the scheme sustainable.

Conditions are attached to mandatory DFGs requiring repayment or return of equipment in certain circumstances. Whilst no grant has been repaid we continue to recycle equipment to keep costs lower. 100 grants/loans with were completed in 2013-14 of which 64 were DFGs.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the programme does not continue then there will be limited alternative opportunities for householders to access the necessary funding to effect essential improvements and repairs to their homes. There will be an increase in the health related illnesses as a consequence of poor housing and financial impact on the NHS and social care budget. Our efforts to reduce fuel poverty and carbon emissions will be curtailed.

The programme is rolling five-year programme and there will be financial commitments carried over in to 2015-16. Some provision (approx 50% of the proposed budget) will need to be made to fund this element even if a decision to curtail the overall programme has to be exercised.

The programme is split between discretionary and mandatory schemes so that provision will need to be made to support a modified programme to deliver mandatory grants.

Failure to administer mandatory DFGs is likely to result in a high level of public dissatisfaction, legal challenges and ombudsman enquiries.

The proposed budget is sufficient to meet the priority needs set out in the home improvement policy. There would be a loss of income if the grant programme is scaled back. Almost all discretionary grants are conditional upon repayment on future sale of the property. This approach is a feature of the current policy and has generated increasing levels of repayments. Approximately £54,000 was repaid in 2013-14 which is helping to make the scheme more sustainable in future years.

5. Options

The nature of the programme is such that there are no alternative options. However the level of funding can be scaled back if there are insufficient resources. The implications of these are set out in section 3.

6. Consents required:		Yes/No			Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	no		Building Regulations required?		no
Any other consent required?	no				

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
Grants/Loans)	600	600	600	600	600	3,000
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	600	600	600	600	600	3,000
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	It is an outline estimate figure however the budget has matched expenditure in previous years.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts	60	60	60	60	60	300
Contributions						0
Grants	302	250	250	250	250	1,302
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	362	310	310	310	310	1,602
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	It is an outline estimate figure however expenditure has matched the budget in previous years. Funding from 2016-17 has not yet been confirmed.					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	N/A		
Component 2	N/A		

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	ICT Renewals Fund
Location	N/a
Landowner	N/a

Officer responsible for project	Steve Wragge-Morley
Service Unit responsible for project	Business Systems

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Cllr Murray Grubb Junior
--	--------------------------

1. Description of project

The ICT Renewals Fund is a rechargeable fund used to procure ICT hardware, software and services required to implement new ICT projects, replace existing hardware and infrastructure, and obtain software and licensing for ICT systems. There are several categories of expenditure and a process to ensure we allocate the fund appropriately.

Business Systems manages the fund. The Head of Business Systems has delegated authority to spend the fund. The Head of Business Systems approves all expenditure. The fund provides for the following types of ICT procurement.

1. Desktop hardware – for example, new or replacement thin clients, computers, printers, monitors used by staff.
2. Communications equipment – for example, telephone handsets, telephone switches and associated systems and licensing.
3. Infrastructure – for example, servers, switches, cabling, specialist appliances for security or other purposes such as electronic gateways for home working.
4. Software and licensing for desktop, server and systems – for example, Microsoft Office licences, database licenses.
5. Corporate projects and upgrades – for example, to upgrade the email system or the intranet to the current version or to introduce new corporate software such as web monitoring or network management tools.
6. Service based projects and upgrades – for example, to introduce a new module to the Revenues system or a replacement ticketing management system.

The fund only provides capital expenditure and cannot provide on-going costs such as annual maintenance (these are budgeted from service area revenue budgets).

We control expenditure through the fund in a number of ways. All bids to the fund have a business case and are processed through Business Systems to ensure that expenditure complies with the current ICT Strategy, meets corporate objectives, is technically appropriate, complies with all ICT policies (including security), avoids duplication, is consistent with other work in progress, can be appropriately supported during implementation and in use. Business Systems provide advice and assistance to services to ensure bids meet these criteria. All expenditure (other than routine or emergency equipment replacement) requires business case approval. Routine and emergency equipment replacement requires authorisation by the Head of Business Systems. Procurement from the fund complies with the usual procurement rules of the Council, based on the overall value of a project or item (over an appropriate period).

Expenditure from the fund takes the form of a loan to the relevant service paid back over a period of years (typically four years). This spreads the cost of the investment over part of the usable service life of the systems involved.

An appendix to this bid pro-forma shows the expected areas of expenditure over the coming twelve months and beyond. We can only estimate expenditure at this stage. We obtain accurate costing as part of the business case when Business Systems consider the bid for funding. Some bids

currently have no estimate of expenditure. We will add information about these additional items when available through the scoping and business case process.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12 months	1 April 2015
Contract works		

3. Justification for project

ICT increasingly underlies service delivery across the Council. The proper funding of ICT systems, projects and software is vital to achieve the service aims of the Council. The ICT Renewals fund provides funding of ICT across all services. A rigorous process controls the individual items of expenditure whilst maintaining appropriate flexibility to expedite projects in a timely manner. There are no legal or statutory requirements other than the Council's procurement rules, although expenditure on ICT often enables services and systems compliance with updated legislation. For example, changes to Planning or Environmental Health regulations might require a change to business systems supporting those services.

ICT features directly or indirectly in all service plans as a means of delivering services and improvement. It is usual for services to utilise the ICT Renewals Fund to provide new systems and change existing systems. Even if funding for ICT is from another source, we still require business case approval by the Head of Business Systems. This ensures appropriate use of ICT.

ICT supports transformation in a number of significant areas including customer services where channel shift, customer management and telephony require ICT investment; automation where manual or old technology processes are updated to take advantage of the benefits of modern technology such as using workflow and the intranet; flexible working where home working, security, authentication, information management and partnership working all require ICT investment to enable the culture shift envisaged by this project. The ICT Renewals Fund provides the funding enabling this work to continue. Appropriate investment in new technology can reduce costs and increase efficiency.

Partnership working is an increasing trend. For instance, the Surrey wide Unicorn network is delivering savings for ICT networks in Surrey and enables partnership working, more efficient and cheaper telephony and other corporate services. This requires investment to take advantage of the benefits. Similarly, the new Surrey data centres enable partners to share systems and resources at lower cost than commercial alternatives. We expect that by April 2015, when this bid becomes effective, that the majority of server based computing will have been transferred to the Surrey data Centre. This is a major change in the way ICT services are provided and, as a consequence, IT Renewals funding is expected to be around £100,000 less than it would have been. A matching growth bid for revenue funding for the Surrey Data Centre has also been prepared.

There is an extant approval for £400,000 for the years 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18. The cost of ICT Renewals does not have any borrowing implication because it is funded by reserve and repaid by revenue repayments. The attached schedule (Appendix 1) shows the investments and current known bids that we expect to come forward during the next 12 months and beyond. The schedule shows an estimated value and also the significance, scale and priority of the project, where known. An estimate covering anticipated expenditure on the hardware and software replacement required for the general running of the existing the ICT service is also included in the schedule. The higher bid for 2015-16 reflects our plans to deliver of many of these projects as part of our transformation programme leading to a digital council, during 2015. It is likely that other items will emerge during the year and the priority order will remain fluid until the start of the year.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

All services use ICT; it is increasing not decreasing in significance, and requires funding. If we do not use the ICT Renewals Fund for this purpose, we will require another funding mechanism to maintain services.

5. Options

The alternatives to the existing ICT Renewals Fund are to consider each item individually, which is not very practicable as the majority of items are small (such as individual replacement equipment items or software licences); to provide funds to each service to spend in their service area but this would greatly reduce the governance, corporate and strategic nature of ICT procurement and lead to disparities, security and compliance issues and could make operation of the systems very complex or even impossible, because so many elements of systems integrate. Increasingly, there is a need to consider the wider options of working with partners and making use of or linking in to existing ICT infrastructure and investments. Alternatively, if ICT services are outsourced, elements of future investment can be included in any contract arrangements.

The current arrangements have worked well over a number of years. Appropriate controls and reporting are in place providing a transparent process for the investment in future ICT projects.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Other (ICT)	515	500	350	350	350	2,065
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	515	500	350	350	350	2,065
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	This estimate is an estimated figure based on previous experience.					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	The expected life of the assets varies for each item and project but is typically a minimum of five years.	£250,000	5 – 8 years
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Repayments into the fund appear in the revenue budget of the relevant services.					

Appendix to Capital Bid - ICT Renewals Funding									Date 29 August 2014				
Major ICT project	Project bid list items requiring IT Renewals funding	(C)urrent (F)uture project	Supports Transformation?	1=low				Estimate 1=<£1K 2=<£10K 3=<£50K 4=<£100K 5=>£100K	2015 - 16	2016 - 17	2017 - 18	Notes	Project status
				Priority 1-5	Scale 1-10	Significance 1-10	Score (max 25)						
Section 1: ICT Service expenditure to retain functional estate													
	Replacement desktop hardware	C	Y	5	5	5	15	3	£10,000				
	Replacement Server hardware	O	Y	5	8	8	21	4	£5,000				
	Security systems and changes	O	Y	5	5	10	20	4	£20,000	£10,000	£10,000		
	Server storage capacity	O	Y	5	5	8	18	3	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000		
	Software licences	O	Y	5	8	8	21	5	£150,000				
								Sub total	£190,000	£15,000	£15,000		
Section 2: Corporate project bids													
	Customer Relationship Management / Case management	C	Y	5	5	8	18	5	£25,000	£25,000	£10,000	Includes Customer Service Centre functions, property and citizen accounts. Project starts 2013.	Bronze
x	Information management - Scanning project	C	Y	4	8	9	21	5	£25,000	£25,000	£25,000		Bronze
x	Electronic document and records management (File 360)	O	Y	4	8	9	21	4	£12,500	£12,500	£12,500		Bronze
x	Intranet development programme	C	Y	5	3	7	15	3				Project feeds into flexible working and automation. Initial work in 2013.	Silver
	Flexible working	F	Y	4	6	6	16	4	£60,000			Project feeds into flexible working. Need further research for this bid	Bronze
x	Surrey Data Centre	C	Y	3	5	7	15	3	£10,000				Bronze
	The office - video conferencing	F	Y	1	3	3	7	3	£25,000			Links to flexible working.	deminimus
x	Unified communications	F	Y	3	6	8	17	4	£100,000			Supports flexible working.	Silver
	WiFi at Millmead	C	Y	3	2	6	11	2	£25,000			Flexible working, meeting room facilities improvement.	deminimus
								Sub total	£282,500	£62,500	£47,500		

Major ICT project	Project bid list items requiring IT Renewals funding	(C)urrent (O)ngoing (F)uture project	Supports Transformation?	1=low				Estimate 1=<£1K 2=<£10K 3=<£50K 4=<£100K 5=>£100K	2015 - 16	2016 - 17	2017 - 18	Notes	Project status
				Priority 1-5	Scale 1-10	Significance 1-10	Score (max 25)						
Section 3: Service Based Project bids													
x	Car Parks system replacement	F	Y	4	6	5	15	3	£0	£0	£0	Approx £50K from car parks reserves in 14/15.	Bronze
	Bereavement bookings	F					0	TBA				Awaiting further information on this bid.	tba
	Building control mobile working	F	Y	2	3	3	8	2	£8,000				deminimus
	eFinancials upgrade	F		2	6	6	14	3	£17,000			Likely to be around Nov 2015	Bronze
	Neighbourhood & Housing service/system improvement	C										Awaiting further information on this bid.	tba
	Planning Policy and local plan database	F					0	TBA				Awaiting further information on this bid.	tba
	Planning Electronic delivery of plans	F	Y				0	TBA				Awaiting further information on this bid.	tba
	Planning reporting server	F										Awaiting further information on this bid.	tba
	Procurement and tender management system (ITT and ITQs etc for Legal)	F		2	4	4	10	3				Possible purchase or use of SCC system	Bronze
	Universal credit customer interface	F	Y					TBA				Awaiting further information on this bid.	tba
	XRM link to eFinancials	F	Y	1	2	2	5	TBA				May be accommodated in the Purchase to Pay project or else internal development	tba
								Sub total	£25,000	£0	£0		
								TOTAL	£497,500	£77,500	£62,500		
<p>Project listing notes: Priority reflects the criticality of completing the project (often because it has an effect on existing systems or other projects). Scale is the size of the project. Significance is the benefit and effect of the project on either the organisation or the service. The expenditure in Section 1 is estimated based on typical annual costs incurred on replacement hardware and software caused by failure, service or staff changes. The projects in Part 2 and Part 3 of the listing are bids and subject to scrutiny and a decision process to determine if and when they should proceed. Much of the information required to complete the table will only become available as business cases are produced for each project bid. The process to complete Section 3 listing for future years is ongoing and more project bids are expected to be added. All bids in Section 3 are yet to be approved. Projects exceeding £50,000 in value will be subject to a separate Management Team report.</p>													

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Lift Replacement
Location	York Road, Farnham Road and Castle Car Parks
Landowner	GBC

Officer responsible for project	Paresh Rajani/Kevin McKee
Service Unit responsible for project	Operational Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
---	--

1. Description of project

To let a contract for the replacement of lifts in a number of housing sites and car parks

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	8	April 2015
Contract works	36 (phased with one set of lifts a year)	Jan 2016

3. Justification for project

The lifts are needed to provide access to the multi storey car parks particularly for those who find walking difficult. The existing lifts are old and have a higher risk of failure and maintenance costs are likely to rise. It is important that they are replaced. The lifts in Bedford Road were subject to a bid to the Executive and the cost will be split with housing as they serve the residential lifts as well as the car park.

The project will be funded from the car park maintenance reserve.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

The lifts will be subject to higher maintenance costs and more frequent failure

5. Options

Continue to repair the existing lifts

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?
Any other consent required?	No	No

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments		130	130	130		390
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services		13	13	13		39
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	143	143	143	0	429
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	The figures are estimates based on previous work. It is requested that the funding is taken from the car park maintenance reserve.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	The lifts should last for at least 20 years.		
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	There are no expected additional revenue costs or savings.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	'Guildford gyratory package' for capital 'local contribution' to two replacement pedestrian and cycle bridges at Walnut Bridge and Wooden Bridge – Guildford Contribution to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
Location	Guildford borough
Landowner	Various – likely to be Surrey County Council as the Local Highway Authority, other public sector or third sector organisation

Officer responsible for project	Barry Fagg
Service Unit responsible for project	Planning Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Cllr Stephen Mansbridge and Cllr Matt Furniss
---	---

1. Description of project

This Bid for Funding will provide Guildford Borough Council's capital local contribution of £950,000 to the 'Guildford Gyratory Package' (the name of the package may be subject to change).

The capital local contribution of £950,000 million will be added to provisional funding allocation for £3.52 million from the Local Growth Fund, which is administered by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The total of £4.47 million is the capital cost for the package, as estimated by Surrey County Council.

The 'Guildford Gyratory Sustainable Approaches Package' consists of two schemes:

- The replacement of the existing Walnut Bridge, which provides a pedestrian connection between Walnut Tree Close and the Bedford Road area. The present structure allows for pedestrians and wheelchair users, with cyclists required to dismount. The aspiration for a replacement structure is that it would be a wider structure which allows for passage by pedestrians and wheelchair users, as at present, and also cyclists (without dismounting from their bicycles).
- The replacement of the existing Wooden Bridge, which provides a pedestrian connection between areas to the north and south of the east-west A3 trunk road and A25 Middleton Road/Woodbridge Road corridors. The present structure allows for pedestrians, with cyclists required to dismount. The aspiration for a replacement structure is that it would be a wider structure which allows for passage by pedestrians, cyclists (without dismounting from their bicycles) and wheelchair users.

Guildford Borough Council's capital local contribution will be limited to £950,000 to the capital cost of the package. Guildford Borough Council will prioritise the delivery of a replacement Walnut Bridge, such that should there be any increase in the total cost of the package for the two replacement bridges above £4.47 million, we will either expect to limit the package to the replacement Walnut Bridge scheme alone, or will ask Surrey County Council, the Highways Agency and/or the Enterprise M3 LEP to fund the additional cost. A Memorandum of Agreement will be agreed with the parties to agree the above.

There may be scope for Guildford Borough Council to recover some or all of its capital local contribution at a later date via planning contributions and, in future, from Community Infrastructure Levy financial contributions.

The Corporate Plan (April 2013- March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.

The Head of Planning Services will oversee negotiations regarding the arrangements for the allocation of Guildford Borough Council's capital local contribution, in consultation with the lead councillors with responsibility for planning and infrastructure.

The project is considered to be 'Important'.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12-24 months	November 2014
Contract works	12-24 months	November 2016

3. Justification for project
The Corporate Plan (April 2013- March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.
The project provides wider network benefits, such as reduced congestion or an increase in sustainable transport.

4. Implications if project not undertaken
If the bid fails, it is significantly less likely that there will be investment in new transport schemes from the Local Growth Fund and other funding opportunities in 2016-17 and subsequent years.

5. Options
There are no further viable options.

6. Consents required	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes.	Building Regulations required?
Any other consent required?	Consents from Surrey County Council for both bridges and Highways for replacement Wooden Bridge.	No.

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Gross cost of work - payment to Enterprise M3 LEP or their agent		2,369	2,100			4,469
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	2,369	2,100	0	0	4,469
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Surrey County Council's 'Strategic Economic Plan Investments – Initial Expressions of Interest' for 'Guildford Gyrotory Package' circulated 13 February 2014.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
SCC contributon			167			167
Enterprise M3 LEP Local Growth Fund		2,000	1,352			3,352
Total External Funding	0	2,000	1,519	0	0	3,519
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or is it an outline estimate figure?	Surrey County Council's 'Strategic Economic Plan Investments – Initial Expressions of Interest' for 'Guildford Gyrotory Package' circulated 13 February 2014.					
S106 reference number if known	n/a					

9. Expected useful life of the asset						
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given						
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)			
Component 1	Walnut Bridge	TBD	30 years.			
Component 2	Wooden Bridge	TBD	30 years			
10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	<p>This section only relates to the replacement Walnut Bridge which is a Guildford Borough Council owned and maintained structure.</p> <p>Working assumption is that maintenance costs for replacement Walnut Bridge will remain as at present.</p> <p>Wooden Bridge is a Highways Agency owned and maintained structure and will remain that Highways Agency's responsibility.</p>					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Guildford Heart of Heritage - delivery phase (subject to us being successful in the development phase of the bid)
Location	Guildford Castle and Museum
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Jill Draper
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development
Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Gordon Jackson

1. Description of project

The castle and museum development project, Guildford Heart of Heritage, is a major scheme that will unite these adjacent sites, transform them into a key cultural, tourist attraction and establish them as the heart of a new heritage quarter in Guildford. The Council is seeking significant funding for the project from the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

The project includes a programme of major capital works covering:

- New build: new entrance and reception within the castle gardens; temporary exhibition space built into medieval ruins; a new building linking new spaces with the existing museum and providing lift access to all floors, public facilities and new display areas; a new café in the gardens serving the castle, gardens and museum
- Conservation of historic ruins and buildings
- New museum displays, telling the story of the town and acting as a gateway to the town's heritage
- Refurbishment of the Quarry Street side of the museum to form a learning suite and incorporate the Victorian Schoolroom setup, currently housed in 39 ½ Castle Street
- Interpretation of the castle site in the castle gardens

The project also includes a full programme of new or improved public services, events and activities that form part of its activity plan. An activity plan covers the services that will be delivered as part of the project. It is complementary to works to, and development of, the heritage site and is a requirement of the HLF. The activity plan starts before the redeveloped site is open to the public and extends over the first two years of opening.

The HLF's grant application process is in two phases and partnership funding from the applicant organisation is required at each:

- the first or development phase follows a successful first-round application to the HLF. During this phase, a maximum of two years, the project is worked up in detail. This leads to a second-round application to the HLF. Some partnership funding of the development phase was approved in 2012-13. In the current bid round officers have submitted a separate, second bid for partnership funding to provide the remainder of the development phase funding required.
- the second or delivery phase follows a successful second-round application to the HLF. During this phase the project is implemented and completed. This bid is for partnership funding of the delivery phase of the project.

The maximum funding that the HLF can contribute to a project at regional committee level is £1,999,999. This covers their total contribution across phases one and two. This bid seeks funding towards an estimated total delivery phase cost of £5.7 million, comprising £5 million capital costs and £0.7 million revenue. The breakdown of expected income is:

Source	Funding contributions
Total project costs	£5.7 million
HLF	(£1.7 million)
3 rd party fundraising	(£1.6 million)
Net cost to Council	£2.4 million

All figures are in draft form at this stage and will be refined and reviewed through the development phase. These costs will be finalised at the point of the second-round application to the HLF, projected date of submission, November 2016.

The third party fundraising target is not guaranteed, however, Guildford Cathedral have been successful in raising £1.3m between September 2013 and 2014 towards their HLF project. The Council has an outline fundraising strategy for the Heart of Heritage project, commissioned from an experienced fundraiser. It will begin work, shortly, on an initial action from this, setting up an appeal committee. This will be ready to launch an appeal should the Council achieve a first-round pass in March 2015. A fundraiser will also be employed during the project's development phase to promote the project and set up a full campaign. At date of preparing this form the Council has indicated a willingness to consider underwriting this sum, should the full target not be achieved. As fundraising will be carried out during the development phase, the success of the campaign will be known by the deadline for the second-round HLF application.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12	Dec 2016
Contract works	45	Dec 2017

3. Justification for project

The success of this bid is essential to progressing the Castle and museum development project as without partnership funding, the Council will not be eligible for a second -round pass from the HLF and cannot be awarded grant funding.

After five years of development (to date) the project is an integral part of various Council plans and strategies including:

- the Guildford Borough Council Corporate Plan 2013-16, fundamental theme Economy and strategic priority, "Secure investment in Guildford town centre to improve the vitality and vibrancy of retail and heritage" and the action "Better integration of heritage within overall High Street offer and support investment in museum and castle complex and additional borough sites"
- the Guildford Town Centre Vision,
- the Visitor Economy Strategy
- the Heritage Services Forward Plan 2013- 2016 (approved by the Executive in 2013).

Close liaison with the HLF, English Heritage and specialist advisors have produced a project proposal which is believed to now be in a strong position to secure HLF funding. In addition, consultation with stakeholders and target audiences has demonstrated proof of local support for the scheme.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the Council does not make a financial contribution to the delivery phase of the HLF application, the project cannot secure second-round funding and cannot be delivered. Without substantial external funding the project cannot be implemented and the HLF is the only source of grant funding for this type and scale of project. This project is an important element of a number of Council strategic plans; not progressing the project will hamper the Council in achieving these.

5. Options

There are no other viable options for this project

6. Consents required	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?	Yes	Listed building consent Scheduled monument consent	Listed building consent Scheduled monument consent

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Payments	0	0	740	1,480	740	2,960
Consultants Fees	0	141.5	141.5	141.5	0	424.5
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases	0	0	450	0	0	450
Contingency	0	0	150	150	150	450
Other (inflation)	0	0	225	225	225	675
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	141.5	1,706.5	1,996.5	1,115	4,959.5
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Indicative figures, based on 3 rd party estimates, HLF requirements and first draft profiling. These will be revised and refined during the 18 month development phase, which follows a first-round HLF pass. Final figures will be produced for the second-round HLF application in 2016-17.					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						
Contributions						
HLF grant	0	41	494.9	579	323.4	1,438.3
S106						
External fundraising	0	39.6	477.8	559	312.2	1,388.6
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	80.6	972.7	1,138	635.6	2,826.9
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Grant sum is based on estimated HLF grant contribution and current 3 rd party fundraising target. These are indicative figures with first draft profiling. They will be revised and refined during the 18 month development phase, which follows a first-round HLF pass. Final figures will be produced for the second-round HLF application in 2016-17.					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given)

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1		Not known at present	
Component 2		Not known at present	

10. Revenue Implications						
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employees' costs	0	0	73.6	147.1	73.6	294.3
Other costs		20.8	111.7	193.8	102.8	429.1
Less additional income		(12.4)	(110.0)	(202.3)	(104.7)	(429.4)
Net additional expenditure/(income)		8.4	75.3	138.6	71.7	294
Please provide further details:	<p>Employees costs include training and travel.</p> <p>Other costs covers activity costs (including direct costs of planning and delivering services and volunteer "in kind" costs).</p> <p>Additional income covers estimated HLF grant contribution, volunteer in kind income and current 3rd party fundraising target.</p>					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Woodbridge Road Sports ground Invest to Save
Location	Woodbridge Road Sports ground (Charitable site)
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council (Trustee of the Land)

Officer responsible for project	Paul Stacey
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Councillor Mansbridge
---	-----------------------

1. Description of project

Partnership funding to facilitate investment by Surrey County Cricket Club in to redeveloping the pavilion as a community asset to derive income to reinvest in to the charitable land.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12	September 2014
Contract works	6	October 2015

3. Justification for project

The Council is the Trustee of the Woodbridge Road Sports ground Charity and subsidises the site. The Council has an opportunity to establish a joint venture with Surrey County Cricket Club and Guildford Cricket Club to improve the facilities to further the charity and reduce the revenue burden on the Council.

This venture involves the creation of a management company, and a capital contribution to improve the pavilion and spectator facilities on the site to increase community use and income generating potential to further the charity. Surrey County Cricket will lead on the delivery of the project and be a funding partner along with Guildford Cricket Club. This will also see the Councils grant to the cricket festival drop to zero in the coming years. The ground will officially be used as Surrey County Cricket Clubs second match venue after the oval

The venture is fully contingent on approval from the Charity Commission due process where if approved a 50 year lease will be granted to Woodbridge Road Sports ground Management Company.

This bid is for £150,000.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

No financial savings will be achieved by the Council and we will continue to subsidise the site.

5. Options

No others available as the site is currently leased to Guildford Cricket Club and they have security of tenure. They are willing to surrender the lease under this venture

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?	Yes	Charity Commission	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	1,162					1,162
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	1,162	0	0	0	0	1,162
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Estimate and agreed budget between partners. Surrey County Cricket club to deliver the scheme, GBC contribution £150,000					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts	475					475
Contributions	250					250
Grants	50					50
S106	237					237
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	1,012	0	0	0	0	1,012
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Estimate and known. Conditional on Charity Commission approval for receipts. £250,000 agreed from Surrey County Cricket Club. Grants & S106 TBC					
S106 reference number if known	13/P/02216, 14/P/00963, 14/P/01614 , 14/P/01246					

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Pavilion	1,100,000	35
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs	70					70
Less additional income			(106)	(20)		0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	70	0	(106)	(20)	0	(56)
Please provide further details:	There will be a one-year cost of supporting the establishment of a management company then the Councils revenue subsidy to the charity can drop to c £45,000, and a new lease granted at a new market rent providing an annual net saving of around £126,000. This however is contingent on the final business model being agreed between the various parties. Over 10 years it may be possible for the Councils residual subsidy to drop to zero, giving an annual saving of £171,000. ALL SAVINGS ARE CONTINGENT ON AGREEMENT OF THE FINAL BUSINESS MODEL					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Playground Refurbishment Programme
Location	Sites across the borough
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Sally Astles
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

Parks and Leisure Services are currently developing a new 'Playground Strategy' to cover a full review of our play equipment, its play value, condition and area provision. An assessment of their play value has been completed which highlights the play areas most in need of refurbishment.

Some playgrounds have been improved using s106 funds but unfortunately, this is limited to the wards the development occurs. Many of our playgrounds are in wards where development is not possible, or very limited, and funds do not come forward and therefore these are falling short of the standard achieved in the more prosperous wards. This bid seeks to secure funds to help to address this inequality and provide refurbishment opportunities where it is most needed, rather than just where the s106 is available.

The refurbishment programme will systematically address outdated and tired equipment, including any equipment that does not conform to the EN BS1176 standard. The new equipment will provide for more inclusive and challenging play and will seek to harmonise with the local environment. Replacing old equipment saves time on repairs and allows us to introduce equipment that has been newly developed to meet up to date standards and new thinking on play.

A new more exciting playground creates a positive environment for a child to play and social development with others. Equipment that has high play value has less risk of vandalism, thus creating a safer environment. This capital investment will help to provide the children of the borough with innovative play provision, meeting the needs of both able bodied and children with special needs.

Included in the programme is a refurbishment of Ash Parish Council's skate park funded by a combination of s106 from the ward and a £10,000 capital investment.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	3 months per site	TBC
Contract works	Up to 3 months per site	TBC

3. Justification for project

- Under statute law, there are a number of Acts whose provisions include playgrounds. The key ones are:

Health and Safety at Work Act (1974). There is a duty under Sections 3 and 4 to ensure the health and safety of users, so far as is reasonably practicable. The Health and Safety Executive looks for a systems approach to safety and for playgrounds to meet relevant standards.

Occupier's Liability Act (1957, Revised 1984). This Act requires that people can expect to be reasonably safe when using a playground. Greater care is required where children are concerned.

Children Act (1989). Facilities that have been registered under the Act's requirements need to be safe and suitable for their purpose and meet relevant standards.

2. The works fit in with the Councils Key Strategic Priorities by helping to drive Key Delivery Targets in the following ways:
 - Sustainable local environment – will improve the quality of the natural environment
 - Safe and vibrant community – will contribute towards improving the lives of vulnerable groups (for example, through the provision of a disability roundabout and accessible up to date play equipment)
 - Dynamic economy – it will sustain the Borough’s role as a centre for cultural, heritage and leisure provision, and make it a better place to live and work.

3. The works fit in with the Council’s Corporate Plan by supporting the themes:
 - Development – to ensure that there is appropriate infrastructure, commercial space and a range of homes, built sensitively, without damaging our heritage or countryside.
 - Sustainability – to ensure the services we provide and the borough develops and grows, in the most sustainable way.
 - Society – to evolve a self-reliant and sustaining community, while supporting our most vulnerable residents.

4. Efficiency gains include:
 - Greater use of facilities and land.
 - Reduction in maintenance costs of the existing old equipment.

5. Customer satisfaction through modern, up to date playgrounds of a good standard throughout the borough.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

- Some playgrounds will continue to decline. We do not have sufficient revenue budget to invest in them to the extent required. Refurbishing a play area is very expensive with items of play equipment costing thousands of pounds plus safety surface (where applicable) and installation.
- Unequal provision throughout the borough as capital is only available in wards where there is development potential. For instance, wards such as Westborough and Onslow will have to ‘make do’ whilst other areas have new play areas with the latest equipment.
- Complaints arising from comparisons with other play areas, where s106 has been used to refurbish them will continue and increase.
- Increased resources will be spent on responding and dealing with repairs and maintaining older equipment.
- Possible closure of playgrounds. Very old equipment can become unsafe and ultimately this results in closure as are unlikely to be able to fund the refurbishment through revenue.

5. Options

None, other than s106 as mentioned.

6. Consents required:		Yes/No			Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Not usually	Building Regulations required?			No
Any other consent required?	No				

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments					120	120
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	0	0	0	120	120
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate from knowledge. Money is already in the provisional capital programme for 2015-16 to 2018-19.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Play equipment		10
Component 2	Playground surface		5

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Guildford Riverside Route – Phases 2 and 3 (Millmead to Artington Park and Ride and/or Shalford, and A320 Woking Road to Bowers Lane/Clay Lane respectively)
Location	<p>The Phase 2 scheme connects the key trip generators and attractors in Guildford town centre, business, industrial and retail parks and estates, and the designated 'priority place' of Stoke ward, to, or near to, the following further key trip generators and attractors in the St Catherines and Artington areas: the University of Law, the Surrey Police headquarters at Mount Browne, the Guildway Business Park, the Quadrum Business Park and the well-used 719 space Artington Park & Ride. Alternatively, or additionally, there are also opportunities to improve the existing traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route through Shalford Park onto Dagley Lane, and connections beyond to Shalford.</p> <p>The Phase 3 scheme additionally connects to the above to the Slyfield Industrial Estate and the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP) site, which the Draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites (GBC, July 2014) proposes to allocate for an estimated 1,000 homes together with significant employment uses, a new council waste management depot, waste facilities, a new sewage treatment works (relocated within the site) and a local retail centre.</p>
Landowner	National Trust and Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Barry Fagg
Service Unit responsible for project	Planning Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Cllr Matt Furniss
---	-------------------

1. Description of project

This Bid for Funding will provide Guildford Borough Council's capital local contribution of £600,000 to the Guildford Riverside Route – Phases 2 and 3 (Millmead to Artington Park and Ride and/or Shalford, and A320 Woking Road to Bowers Lane/Clay Lane respectively).

The capital local contribution of £600,000 will be supplemented by a funding allocation for £1.8 million from the Local Growth Fund, which is administered by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The total of £2.4 million is the capital cost for the scheme.

The Corporate Plan (April 2013 - March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.

The existing improved towpath plus the Phase 1 extension of the Guildford Riverside Route (the subject of a separate Bid for Funding) will provide a continuous high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route between key trip generators and attractors in Guildford, namely between Guildford town centre, business, industrial and retail parks and estates, and the designated 'priority place' of Stoke ward, as well as improving the cycling and walking connection from the Stoke ward to the Stag Hill campus of the University of Surrey.

The Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 2 (Millmead to Artington Park and Ride and/or Shalford) improves connections to the University of Law, the Surrey Police headquarters at Mount Browne, the Guildway Business Park, the Quadrum Business Park and the well-used 719 space Artington Park & Ride. Alternatively, or additionally, there are also opportunities to improve the existing traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route through Shalford Park onto Dagley Lane, and connections beyond to Shalford.

The Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 3 (A320 Woking Road to Bowers Lane/Clay Lane) additionally connects to the above to the Slyfield Industrial Estate and the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP) site, which the Draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites (GBC, July 2014) proposes to allocate for an estimated 1,000 homes together with significant employment uses, a new council waste management depot, waste facilities, a new sewage treatment works (relocated within the site) and a local retail centre.

Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Guildford Riverside Route will contribute significantly towards realising walking and cycling networks linking residential areas to key locations in Guildford. This is a key recommendation of the long-term movement strategy to 2050 set out in the Guildford Town and Approaches Movement Study (GTAMS) (Arup, 2014).

The project is considered to be 'Important'.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12 months	April 2015
Contract works	12 months	April 2016

3. Justification for project

This Bid for Funding will provide Guildford Borough Council's capital local contribution of £600,000 to the Guildford Riverside Route – Phases 2 and 3 (Millmead to Artington Park and Ride, and A320 Woking Road to Bowers Lane/Clay Lane respectively).

The capital local contribution of £600,000 will be supplemented by a funding allocation for £1.8 million from the Local Growth Fund, which is administered by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The total of £2.4 million is the capital cost for the scheme.

The Corporate Plan (April 2013- March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.

The existing improved towpath plus the Phase 1 extension of the Guildford Riverside Route (the subject of a separate Bid for Funding) will provide a continuous high-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route between key trip generators and attractors in Guildford, namely between Guildford town centre, business, industrial and retail parks and estates, and the designated 'priority place' of Stoke ward, as well as improving the cycling and walking connection from the Stoke ward to the Stag Hill campus of the University of Surrey.

The Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 2 (Millmead to Artington Park and Ride and/or Shalford) improves connections to the University of Law, the Surrey Police headquarters at Mount Browne, the Guildway Business Park, the Quadrum Business Park and the well-used 719 space Artington Park & Ride. Alternatively, or additionally, there are also opportunities to improve the existing traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route through Shalford Park onto Dagley Lane, and connections beyond to Shalford.

The Guildford Riverside Route – Phase 3 (A320 Woking Road to Bowers Lane/Clay Lane) additionally connects to the above to the Slyfield Industrial Estate and the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP) site, which the Draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites (GBC, July 2014) proposes to allocate for an estimated 1,000 homes together with significant employment uses, a new council waste management depot, waste facilities, a new sewage treatment works (relocated within the site) and a local retail centre.

Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Guildford Riverside Route will contribute significantly towards realising walking and cycling networks linking residential areas to key locations in Guildford. This is a key recommendation of the long-term movement strategy to 2050 set out in the Guildford Town and Approaches Movement Study (GTAMS) (Arup, 2014).

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the bid fails, the Council will not be able to deliver the scheme in 2016-17.

5. Options

There are no further viable options.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No.	Building Regulations required?	No.
Any other consent required?	No. The National Trust is the landowner of the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath and Guildford Borough Council is the landowner of Shalford Park. Accordingly land ownership matters are settled which will facilitate the timely delivery of the potential schemes.		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments		2,400				2,400
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Payment to Enterprise M3 LEP or their agent						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	2,400	0	0	0	2,400
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate figure. GBC contr £600,000					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Enterprise M3 LEP Local Growth Fund		1,800				1,800
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	1,800	0	0	0	1,800
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate figure.					
S106 reference number if known	n/a					

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	High-quality, traffic-free cycling and walking route along the River Wey & Godalming Navigations towpath	£2.4 million	15 years.
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	The towpath is a National Trust asset and the upgraded route will be maintained by the National Trust. The existing traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route through Shalford Park is maintained by Guildford Borough Council.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Capital local contribution to transport schemes for future Local Growth Fund and other funding opportunities
Location	Guildford borough
Landowner	Various – likely to be Surrey County Council as the Local Highway Authority, or other public sector or third sector organisation

Officer responsible for project	Barry Fagg
Service Unit responsible for project	Planning Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Cllr Stephen Mansbridge and Cllr Matt Furniss
---	---

1. Description of project

The Corporate Plan (April 2013- March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.

The project is considered to be 'Important'.

There may be scope for Guildford Borough Council to recover capital 'local contributions' at a later date via planning contributions and, in future, from Community Infrastructure Levy financial contributions.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12	April 2015
Contract works	12-36 months	April 2016

3. Justification for project

This Bid for Funding will provide the capital local contribution to transport schemes for future Local Growth Fund and other funding opportunities. It should be considered in conjunction with the revenue Growth Bid Proposal for 'Feasibility and design of transport schemes for future Local Growth Fund and other funding opportunities'.

The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) is responsible for reviewing, prioritising and approving transport scheme proposals for which funding is sought from the Local Growth Fund, based on advice from its Local Transport Body (LTB). The assurance framework used by the LTB identifies that the prioritisation process will favour proposed transport schemes with a larger capital 'local contribution' from the lead organisation (promoter) and/or their partners, as one aspect considered together with wider value for money and deliverability.

Surrey County Council's position² is that it and the relevant borough/district council will be 'beneficiaries of these transport schemes', and that a cost sharing mechanism for the 'local contributions' should reflect the benefits the scheme provides, such that:

- where a scheme will unlock a significant development opportunity, the prime beneficiary will be the borough/district council that will realise greater economic and financial benefits from this development, and as such, for this type of scheme the borough/district council should make a significant contribution to the funding to reflect the benefits they will realise.
- where a scheme will not lead directly to economic development but will provide wider network benefits, such as reduced congestion or an increase in sustainable transport, the borough/district contribution is lower than it might be were significant development released, as Surrey County Council as highway authority is the prime beneficiary.

Thus, at present and in the foreseeable future, requests will be made to Guildford Borough Council by Surrey County Council to provide a capital 'local contribution' for proposed transport schemes for future Local Growth Fund bidding rounds based on Surrey County Council's cost sharing mechanism. Experience to date is that the capital 'local contribution' is 25% of the capital cost of the proposed transport scheme. Thus, based on Surrey County Council's cost sharing mechanism, where a scheme will unlock a significant development opportunity, Guildford Borough Council will be asked to provide the full capital 'local contribution' of 25% of the capital cost of the proposed transport scheme. And where a scheme will not lead directly to economic development but will provide wider network benefits, Guildford Borough Council will be asked to provide half the capital 'local contribution', with Surrey County Council providing the other half.

Surrey County Council's approach to bidding is to focus on transport schemes costing £5 million or less. So, for examples, for a bid to the Local Growth Fund for a £4 million transport scheme providing wider network benefits, Guildford Borough Council would be asked to provide a £0.5 million capital 'local contribution', representing 12.5% of the total capital cost of the proposed transport scheme.

There may be scope for Guildford Borough Council to recover capital 'local contributions' at a later date via planning contributions and, in future, from Community Infrastructure Levy financial contributions.

The revenue Growth Bid Proposal for 'Feasibility and design of transport schemes for future Local Growth Fund and other funding opportunities' will allow Guildford Borough Council to define future transport schemes which deliver the Council's priorities.

The Corporate Plan (April 2013- March 2016) states that the provision of effective infrastructure and transport services is one of the most pressing issues facing the borough today.

² See item 10 'Supporting Economic Growth through Investment in Highways Infrastructure' at Surrey County Council's cabinet meeting on 23 September 2014, available at <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=120&Mid=3689&Ver=4>

Guildford Borough Council continues to work with Surrey County Council, the Highways Agency, the local enterprise partnership and other agencies to develop short, medium and long-term interventions that tackle traffic congestion and promote sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel.

The Head of Planning Services will oversee negotiations regarding the arrangements for the allocation of the capital allocation, in consultation with the lead councillors with responsibility for planning and infrastructure.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

If the bid fails, it is significantly less likely that there will be investment in new transport schemes from the Local Growth Fund and other funding opportunities in 2016-17.

5. Options

There are no further viable options.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Depends on the transport schemes developed and promoted. 'No' for schemes within existing highway boundaries.	Building Regulations required?	Depends on the transport schemes developed and promoted.
Any other consent required?	Depends on the transport schemes developed and promoted.		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Other Fees						0
Payment to Enterprise M3 LEP or their agent		4,000				4,000
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	4,000	0	0	0	4,000
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Based on rationale set out in section (3).					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Enterprise M3 LEP Local Growth Fund and capital local contribution from Surrey County Council		3,500				3,500
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	3,500	0	0	0	3,500
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Based on rationale set out in section (3).					
S106 reference number if known	n/a					

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Depends on the transport schemes developed and promoted.	£4 million	15 years or longer
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Infrastructure owner is likely to be Surrey County Council as the Local Highway Authority or other public sector or third sector organisation. Also depends on the transport schemes developed and promoted.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Acquisition of Burial Ground and Development of Burial Ground
Location	Guildford Borough
Landowner	Unknown

Officer responsible for project	Paul Stacey
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
---	--

1. Description of project

The fundamental service review of Bereavement Services identified a shortage of burial space and the need to acquire a new site. This is essential to sustain bereavement services for the boroughs residents and work has progressed on the assessing suitable sites for acquisition.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12-24	06/15
Contract works	12-48	06/16

3. Justification for project

The Fundamental Service Review of Bereavement Services identified a shortage of burial space and it was agreed by the Executive to seek a new burial ground subject to the business case involved. The Council has approximately five years of burial space left and is currently not able to cater for a range of faiths and cultures in an increasingly diverse society with a growing population. Some sites have been identified that may be possible to develop and therefore funding is required to acquire and develop a site.

The cost of acquisition and development is difficult to estimate and will require feasibility work for which funds have already been approved both capital and revenue and this work is progressing.

A site of a minimum of five acres is required to create a viable site from a financial perspective. The development of a site can be phased as the need for burial space arises reducing annual maintenance costs. Typical indications suggest that the first acre costs in the region of £250,000 to develop with each subsequent acre costing in the region of £50,000. These figures are however fully contingent on the level of infrastructure required such as roads, types of burials offered, paths, highway improvements, drainage and so on.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

The Council will not be able to provide burial space for an increasing population and many will not have access to this provision due to where they live and their faith and culture. Once the Council burial grounds are full income will no longer be derived from them putting further pressure on the revenue budget.

5. Options

Reuse of existing Graves. Currently this is not feasible due to legislation, resource, reputational and cultural implications

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?	Yes	Environment Agency GP3	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition	750	0				750
Contractor Payments	0	750				750
Consultants Fees	250	0				250
Salaries: Property Services	0	0				0
Salaries: Housing Services	0	0				0
Salaries: Engineers	0	0				0
Other Fees	0	0				0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	1,000	750	0	0	0	1,750
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	This estimate is unknown depending on which site, land values and development cost. Potential burial ground values have more value than agricultural land currently in the region of £8,000-£10,000 per acre and therefore the cost could be significantly less than the funds being bid for.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Burial ground	1,650,000	100 years
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs			50	50	50	150
Other costs			20	20	20	60
Less additional income			(50)	(70)	(90)	(210)
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	20	0	(20)	0
Please provide further details:	Costs of employees, plant, site and utilities. Income derived from sales of grave spaces, vaults, crypts and memorials some of which will derive occasional high values. Typically 600 burials per acre can be achieved. Each burial can derive in the region of £2,260 at the current level of fees and charges achieving £1.356 million of income per acre. However many factors come in to play such as the rate of burial per annum, type of burial, maintenance costs utilities etc. Until a site is known and the business case is tested it is hard to forecast the revenue implications for the Council.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Renewables Programme Development
Location	Various locations at GBC operations
Landowner	GBC

Officer responsible for project	Chris Reynolds
Service Unit responsible for project	Corporate Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Matt Furniss
--	--------------

1. Description of project

This capital bid relates to new funds needed to support the implementation of recommendations that come out of the Renewables mapping exercise that has not yet completed so the recommendations can only be anticipated at this stage.

This bid also includes £25,000 for a micro scale hydro-electric generator at a weir, something that we can anticipate from the renewables mapping exercise and would be required as a minimum if we are to have a credible interest in reducing our carbon foot-print – and given the lack of scope for wind power.

Finally this bid includes an amount of £40,000 for a water source heat pump project at the electric theatre, again utilising the renewables opportunity of the river. This project has very high reputational benefits which balance the likely lower financial payback. The reputational benefits are likely to include ministerial interest through being at the vanguard of the implementation of this technology, and the uniqueness of the scheme itself (using the cooling pipes from the old power station to provide heat to the theatre).

This bid links to bid ED5 – Electric Theatre boilers

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	3	Aug 2015
Contract works	5	November 2015

3. Justification for project

The scheme should go ahead because it provides:-

- carbon savings
- long term financial savings with ultimate payback on capital
- additional savings in carbon allowance costs
- reduced reported carbon foot-print
- very high reputational benefits
- local generation of electricity provides better resilience in the face of the UK not being able to meet demand through centralised supply.

The scheme directly supports “promoting sustainability”, “reduced energy consumption”, “protecting our environment”.

The projected value of energy savings as a result of this project are detailed in table 10.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Higher energy and carbon costs now and in the future. Poorer reputation for GBC.

5. Options

The projects are carefully considered to give maximum benefit based on carbon savings and financial payback.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?	Yes	Permit for extraction from the river	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments	40					40
Consultants Fees	25					25
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	65	0	0	0	0	65
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate based on known costs from a limited number of similar schemes already implemented.					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Installation – Heat Pump	40,000	25
Component 2	Installation – Small hydro plant	25,000	25

10. Revenue Implications

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs	0	(3)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(24)
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	(3)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(24)
Please provide further details:	Projections based on the energy generated from the operation of a hydro-electric generator and energy savings from a water source heat pump.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Void investment property refurbishment fund
Location	
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Alison Peet
Service Unit responsible for project	Economic Development

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Nigel Manning
---	---------------

1. Description of project

Essential project: An extension to the fund of £100,000 per annum to refurbish any void investment properties in order to facilitate re-letting as soon as possible.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.		
Contract works	Ongoing	Jan 2014

3. Justification for project

Any investment property which becomes vacant, whether as a result of lease expiry, surrender or even forfeiture, which is in need of works being carried out, requires funding through this scheme, which was originally set up in February 2013.

It fits with the economy theme in the Corporate Plan as it secures investment, supports businesses and growth and employment and with the developing our council theme as it increases income.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Properties will remain vacant and unlet or we will have to reduce the rent substantially to reflect the works required, thereby reducing our rent roll.

5. Options

Other options such as not carrying out refurbishment and attempting to market the properties in need of work would lead to significant void periods and/or substantial rent reductions.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?		Building Regulations required?
Any other consent required?		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	100	100	100	100	100	500
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	100	100	100	100	100	500
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate figure. 2015-16 to 2017-18 are already in the programme					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	N/a					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1			
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Provision of a single gypsy pitch
Location	Wyke Avenue Normandy
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Samantha Hutchison
Service Unit responsible for project	NHMS

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

The provision of a single public pitch for a gypsy/traveller household. The pitch would be let following an allocation to a household made in accordance with our allocation policy. There is a clearly established need for more pitches for this section of our community and a shortfall of potential sites.

Securing the provision of additional pitches is a priority under the Development theme set out in our Corporate Plan.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	4 months	February 2015
Contract works	3 months	June 2015

3. Justification for project

Securing the provision of additional pitches is a priority under the Development theme set out in our Corporate Plan. Whilst we do not have a statutory duty to provide pitches, the Council is clear in its approach to supporting all minority groups. Such provision clearly demonstrates our commitment.

There is a requirement through the Local Plan process that we secure adequate accommodation provision against the objectively assessed need. Both the need and shortfall are accepted in respect of this group and securing additional accommodation is proving extremely challenging.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

We will not reduce the shortfall in the identified need. This may lead to an increase in unauthorised encampments or further overcrowding on the existing sites.

5. Options

The location of the site is such that planning permission is only likely to be possible if it is considered to be a rural exception site. This means it cannot be for owner occupation.

A Housing Association is unlikely to promote such a scheme as it's a one off pitch and will not generate a sufficient financial return.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?	Usual development consents		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	120	5				125
Consultants Fees	10					10
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services	10					10
Salaries: Engineers	3					3
Other Fees	10					10
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	153	5	0	0	0	158
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants	20					0
S106						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Subject to successful bid and prevailing HCA policy at the time. At this point would not take into account.					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Infrastructure and buildings	110,000	60
Component 2	Fittings	10,000	20

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs	1.5					1.5
Less additional income	(2.9)					(2.9)
Net additional expenditure/(income)	(1.4)	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Assumed 85% collection rate for rent					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Replacement Roof and Steel repairs at Spectrum
Location	Guildford Spectrum
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Jonathan Sewell
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

The project is the progressive replacement of the five main roofs that cover Guildford Spectrum. The project also covers repairs to structural steelwork due to the effects of corrosion and its subsequent repainting with specialist coating. Improved ground drainage is also required to reduce the chances of future leaks.

This project is essential to maintain the usability and safety of the structure in the long term. Building Regulations require a higher standard of insulation be installed which will affect the profile of the roofs. This will improve energy consumption but the impact of this will be very difficult to measure in advance. The roof glazing will also require changing as the roof profile will change and the glazing is nearing the end of its life and failure to do this now would require a further closure in the relatively near future. In order to reduce the corrosive impact of the pool water and condensation the air handling in the swimming pool hall also requires to be upgraded.

This project will require the progressive partial closure of Guildford Spectrum while work takes place.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	16 months	December 2014
Contract works	20 months	April 2016

3. Justification for project

Guildford Spectrum is the largest leisure complex of its type in the UK. It contains an international standard ice rink, 4 swimming pools, a 32 lane ten pin bowling centre, multi-court sports hall, squash courts, children's soft play, a fully equipped health and fitness suite and an athletics and football stadium. The complex also hosts over 60 major events each year, including national league Ice hockey and basketball. Spectrum attracts 1.7 million visits each year, with the busiest week being the February school half term with a total of over 60,000 visits. The venue is currently operated by Freedom Leisure (FL), a charitable trust, on behalf of Guildford Borough Council. FL pay the council just under £1 million per annum to operate the Guildford sites currently. The council is responsible for a number of items under the Leisure Partnership Agreement including structural repairs and roof replacement.

There have been a number of problems with the roofs at the Spectrum Leisure Centre, related to leaking, which occurred as the Spectrum Centre reached practical completion towards the end of 1992 and has continued since practical completion was achieved on 19 January 1993, as well as there being other defects associated with the building. These problems were mitigated through the £2 million building remedial works project that took place in 2007 however the building has continued to leak and it was recognised that these leaks would get progressively worse and would only be resolved by progressively replacing the roof. A provisional capital bid was approved in 2009-10 programme.

A report was commissioned from the roof expert who advised the council during the Sunleys case. The report was reviewed and updated in March 2014 to reflect the report from the structural engineers on the state of the steelwork within the Leisure Pool. The steelwork in this area is due to the nature of the facilities, the most at risk of corrosion in the venue. The structural engineers found that although

corrosion was clearly present it was not yet at a level that affected the structural integrity.

A further report investigating the corrosion in the Competition and Dive Pool areas has recently been commissioned as pockets of aggressive corrosion have been identified in the Competition Pool area. Initial inspections have shown that the columns remain structurally sound however repairs are required in the immediate future to ensure this remains the case and the urgency of this situation may further change on completion of current detailed investigations.

This is a very large and complex project which will require closure of sections of the building while work on the roof and steelwork take place. The steelwork in the pools will require to be grit-blasted and repainted with specialist coating while the pool hall is completely empty of water. Large pieces of plant will have to be craned out and replacements craned in to ensure the pool air handling is improved. Once complete, this will improve the experience for customers and staff as well as reducing the opportunity for corrosion due to a hostile atmosphere in the pool hall.

Subject to the structural engineers report on the competition pool area, repairs to heavily corroded steelwork may be necessary in advance of the main roof project. Ideally you would avoid more than one closure to reduce the impact on the customers and therefore the income however health and safety requirements must always take precedence.

Each of the roof replacements will improve the situation for customers of the venues affected. The Arena, with its specialist sprung wooden floor, has extensive leaks currently being managed to avoid significant disruption to users. The leaks over the ice rink potentially affect the safety of the ice rink users due to leaks potentially creating holes in the ice and the convenience of spectators. The Bowl and the Energy Level gym should both be able to operate throughout the works with minimal disruption. The common areas of the building may be restricted and this is likely to impact on use of the reception area and toilet provision and perhaps, more importantly emergency exit routes. Unfortunately until a detailed programme of work with a method statement is available from the successful contractor it is difficult to forecast the real impact on the service.

The anticipated time period of work are as follows:-

Sports Arena (closure albeit some possible opening) = 12 weeks

Ice Rink (complete closure) = 16 weeks

Leisure Pool / Teaching pool (complete closure) = 14 weeks

Competition pool (complete closure) = 7 weeks

Dive Pool (complete closure) = 4 weeks

Energy Level Gym and office (out of hours working) = 10 weeks

Corridor between Sports Arena and Ice Rink (out of hours working for scaffold protection and normal hours for works) = 5 weeks

Corridor between Ice Rink and Office / Energy Level gym Rink (out of hours working for scaffold protection and normal hours for works) = 4 weeks

Street (out of hours working for scaffold protection and normal hours for works) = 9 weeks

Some of these time periods are likely to be concurrent (e.g. the Pools) but that cannot be known until the contractors programme is finalised.

This project of a phased replacing the roof supports the council's key strategic priorities of excellence and value for money by maintain the service to the public for the Leisure Complex which turns over around £10 million per annum and attracts significant visitors due to its regional tourist attraction status.

The project contributes to KDT1, by reducing the energy consumption and therefore the cost of energy used at Spectrum, the cost of which is shared between the council and the operator Freedom Leisure. It will contribute to KDT4, as the council's biggest energy using site, reducing external energy consumption at Spectrum will reduce the councils CO2 emissions. It will contribute to KDT6, by reducing energy consumption and CO2 emissions will contribute towards improvement of the

quality of the natural environment. It will also contribute to KDT14, by making Spectrum a sustainable facility able to offer leisure provision for the town and tourists.

It supports the corporate plan by contributing to the fundamental themes of;

- infrastructure by supporting the partnership with the leisure operator, Freedom Leisure by reducing the external energy consumption.
- sustainability by reducing energy consumption as the

This project will ensure that the council's asset, Guildford Spectrum, is more energy efficient

As the Spectrum is the councils largest energy consumer this will contribute towards the council's key priority to reduce carbon emissions.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Over a period of time the building will progressively leak more, damaging the facilities and affecting the customer experience resulting in loss of income and credibility. In the long term the building will not remain structurally sound and will have to close.

5. Options

Expert advice is that the existing roof cannot be made water tight with more interventions just resulting in progressively more leaks. There are only two other options to replacing the roof, either close the venue totally or rebuild. These other options are felt to be untenable as rebuilding the venue would be a significant cost. It cost around £26m to build in 1992 and to rebuild now is likely to cost significantly more than that. The rebuild insurance value is of the venue is upwards of £80m. Closing the venue would impact on the local residents and the regional visitors and lose a significant business within the town.

6. Consents required:		Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?		The contract with the leisure providers requires them to cooperate with the council's maintenance activities however it also has a mechanism for adjusting their management fee. This recognises that if the venue is not 100% open then it is appropriate to adjust the management fee by the overall net loss to Freedom Leisure. Unfortunately FL record their expenditure in a way that makes the impact of large scale works to the building impossible to forecast with any element of informed calculation	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition	0					0
Contractor Payments	1,952	833				2,785
Consultants Fees	212	138				350
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Other (contingency)	605	260				865
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	2,769	1,231	0	0	0	4,000
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	This estimate is based on the March 2014 expert roof report updated to reflect the state of the Leisure Pool structural steelwork. It is not based on quotations. The risk of unforeseen expenditure is very high and this is reflected in the contingency figure.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Roof & glazing replacement	2,105,000	25
Component 2	Plant and equipment	330,000	20
Component 3	Steelwork repairs	190,000	25
Component 4	Drainage improvements	160,000	25

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs		1,000	600			1,600
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	1,000	600	0	0	1,600
Please provide further details:	The loss of management fee is likely to be significant. It is an exceptionally complex calculation and the likely reality of this calculation will not be able to even be roughly assessed until a contractor is appointed and a final programme submitted that shows the closure impact of the venue.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Home Farm Development Stoke Park – Joint Venture with SCAS
Location	Stoke Park Guildford
Landowner	GBC

Officer responsible for project	Paul Stacey
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	Councillor Furniss
--	--------------------

1. Description of project

This bid is to facilitate the development of Home Farm on Stoke Park as a visitor attraction and to develop income streams for the Council in partnership with others.

At present the buildings are used for the storage of machinery, equipment and materials for the in-house horticultural unit.

The removal of two greenhouses at Stoke Park Nursery and the building of an appropriate barn complex would store equipment and materials in a safer and more secure manner and free up the heritage assets for community use and income generation.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12	09/14
Contract works	12-48	06/15

3. Justification for project**The Property**

Home Farm (adjacent Stoke Park Nursery) forms part of the Stoke Park Estate in central Guildford. Home Farm was built in 1881 as model farm, a period when English agriculture was at the forefront of stock husbandry development and model farms were being constructed by forward thinking landowners to show off their wealth, the quality of their cattle and sheep and their human compassion.

The Victorian farm buildings at the Nightingale Road entrance to Stoke Park are the original model farm now used by the Parks and Countryside Service. The buildings include:

1. A 3 bedroom farmhouse.
2. Stables
3. Farrowing creeps for pigs (Pig Sty's)
4. Dairy
5. Barn
6. Various stores and shed

This important part of Guildford's heritage is not open to the public.

Surrey County Agricultural Society (SCAS)

Surrey County Agricultural Society has delivered the County Show at Stoke Park for over 60 years, the largest one-day agricultural show in the UK attracting in the region of 40,000 visitors each year. They have renewed their lease (2013) for this and a shared barn outside of the complex on the Home Farm estate.

The society is member of the Royal Agricultural Society of England (RASE) whose remit is akin to SCAS but has recently embarked on a new initiative called Innovation for Agriculture (IFA), who will draw upon resources nationally and across the EU to develop and enhance knowledge transfer and improved excellence in agriculture, whilst benefiting rural economies.

The society has various charitable objectives and delivers various other activities and events supporting the rural economy and agriculture across the County. These include:

- Surrey Food and Farming Week
- Surrey County Ploughing Match and Country Fair
- Surrey County Show
- Annual Farm Competitions
- Farm Study – in conjunction with the Surrey Rural Partnership

After the retirement and hard work of Mrs Sonia Ashworth (MBE) as Chief Executive in 2014, the society is now looking to the future and developing its activities. Over the past 9 months, Officers have been in discussion with Richard Todd (New CEO) regarding a potential joint venture in developing the Home Farm estate, which, will deliver the Societies future aims and offer multiple benefits to Stoke Park, the Council and the Borough. At the end of August Officers and the Lead Member (Councillor Furniss) met with the Trustees of SCAS at Home Farm to inspect the premises and discuss a potential joint venture to develop the site.

The Potential Joint Venture

Discussions between both parties have highlighted a number of opportunities that align to both SCAS and the Councils objectives which we both now need to consider, discuss and develop. These include:

1. Developing Stoke Park as a park of regional significance:

- a. Enhancing the public offer through opening up Home Farm and facilitating its use through various activities such as a petting farm, catering offer, meeting rooms, small business workshops
- b. Conserving and promoting an important part of the Boroughs heritage through investing in, maintaining and interpreting the Home Farm premises.
- c. Bring together the boroughs rural interest groups and the community.
- d. An opportunity to relocate some history groups or other charities into one complex.
- e. Engage directly with the immediate and visiting communities as part of a SCAS and Guildford Borough Council outreach programme.
- f. Enabling the County Show to grow and further consolidate its position at Stoke Park.
- g. Opportunity for a park visitor centre, bringing together all interest groups, Council and the public.
- h. Contributing to the Councils work on improving the Visitor Economy.

2. Supporting the rural economy through education and training:

- a. Through enabling SCAS to expand and grow its activities using home farm as a base for knowledge transfer and training.
- b. Enabling the Council to have a greater link with the rural economy.
- c. Enabling the Council to broaden the scope of work and training that it offers through apprenticeships, with Send prison and Christ's College allowing disadvantaged people routes in to obtaining skills and employment.
- d. Developing and accessing best practice for land management in the regional context delivering stewardship schemes derived from national and regional policy.

3. Developing income streams and reducing costs:

- a. By turning the premises from a cost into an income stream.
- b. Reducing the cost of the County Show supporting its long-term financial sustainability by using the premises.
- c. Growing SCAS in its aims and objectives.
- d. Developing other income generating activities such as catering concessions and events benefitting both parties

This is an iterative process where we will continue to discuss options to develop further. Officers consider that this potential venture/offer is a significant opportunity for the Council to deliver multiple benefits that are sustainable over the long term.

Exploration of this venture has the full support of the Lead Councillor and Executive Head of Service (James Whiteman) and has been met with significant interest and enthusiasm by the Trustees of SCAS.

The buildings will need investment which may be jointly funded by SCAS and GBC depending on final business plan to be agreed by the Council which this bid requests. Equally GBC may need to invest in the premises with SCAS coming on board as tenant of the premises. This project needs consider as part of the overall masterplan for Stoke Park, however the buildings will remain as a key feature of the park and will be included within that process. SCAS remain a very attractive partner to work with on this venture

4. Implications if project not undertaken

We await project proposals for the use of the Victorian model farm, however these proposals may not take place should the existing operational use still be in place. The property could be let as a residential dwelling

5. Options

Other partners are not likely to have such a vested interest in the park and be a willing partner to bring the facility to life. SCAS is a sustainable long term partner or tenant

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	yes
Any other consent required?	Yes	Listed Building	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	0	535	0	75	0	610
Consultants Fees	15	40	10	0	0	65
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	15	575	10	75	0	675
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Outline estimate, further feasibility and negotiation required					

8. External Funding

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Unknown but likely rental income, profit share and energy efficiency savings to be gained					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset

Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given

	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Premises/estimated value of property	1,500,000	50
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications

	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Savings and income are very likely but this is not currently known.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Northside Drainage Scheme
Location	Stoke Park North
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Dennis Wheeler
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
---	--

1. Description of project
Drainage Scheme to North Side Stoke Park.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	6	10/14
Contract works	2	08/15

3. Justification for project
Stoke Park North is used for major and minor events covering the County Show, Rugby tournaments, circuses and fun fairs. The ground is often severely damaged and waterlogged during periods of inclement weather giving rise to reinstatement costs and in some instances loss of income. The proposed scheme will provide an appropriate drainage system, water supply for event and a hardstanding loading area to support use and increase the period of when the site is usable for event and activities. Freedom Leisure will be a funding partner in this venture as they operate spectrum leisure centre and also use the land.

4. Implications if project not undertaken
N/A

5. Options
N/A

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	Yes	Land drainage consent	

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments	130					130
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	130	0	0	0	0	130
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions	80					80
Grants						0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Known sum from Freedom Leisure					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1			
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:						

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Stoke Park Bowls Clubs Facilities Investment
Location	Stoke Park
Landowner	Guildford Borough Council

Officer responsible for project	Paul Stacey
Service Unit responsible for project	Parks & Leisure

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
---	--

1. Description of project

Investment in to Guildford Bowls Clubs facilities on Stoke Park to consolidate assets

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	Unknown	Unknown
Contract works	Unknown	Unknown

3. Justification for project

Wey Valley Indoor Bowls Club and Guildford Bowling Club wish to facilitate joint working between the two clubs to consolidate their assets and secure bowling sustainable future for bowling in the borough. Outdoor bowls has generally been a sport in decline across the nation however Guildford and Wey Valley indoor bowls clubs continue to hold steady memberships. Both clubs are due a rent review in the next few years but Guildford wish to become a tenant of WVIBC initially then potentially go on to merge. Guildford Bowling club wish to use the changing and catering facilities at WVIBC and relinquish some of their assets. However to achieve this some building works will be required to provide access from WVIBC on to the bowling greens and to address issues of DDA compliance. This bid is for seed funding to enable the clubs to access external funding and deliver the majority funding themselves.

This bid will form part of the lease negotiations which will see:

- an increased rental income and
- exploration of self management of the greens
- Return of assets which can be offered for other uses or removed alleviating the revenue burden on the Council

This venture has the full support of the regional governing body.

This bid however needs to be contingent on Astolat Bowling Clubs also being involved in this venture. This club has a particularly small membership but wish to see their 50th anniversary in 2017 as a club.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

N/A

5. Options

N/A

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	Yes	Building Regulations required?	Yes
Any other consent required?			

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						0
Contractor Payments						0
Consultants Fees						0
Salaries: Property Services						0
Salaries: Housing Services						0
Salaries: Engineers						0
Other Fees						0
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						0
Other (please state)		35				35
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	35	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Contribution to the cost of the building works					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						0
Contributions						0
Grants	unknown					0
S106						0
Other (please state)						0
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Unknown at this stage					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Bowls clubs and greens	1,500,000	25
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						0
Other costs						0
Less additional income						0
Net additional expenditure/(income)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please provide further details:	Unknown at this stage but savings are likely					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Surface Water Management Plan
Location	Various locations throughout the borough.
Landowner	Various – both public and private

Officer responsible for project	Tim Pilsbury/Geoff Fowler
Service Unit responsible for project	Environment

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	James Whiteman/Matt Furniss
--	-----------------------------

1. Description of project

The Surface Water Management Plan and the Ash Surface Water Study were started early in 2013 and recently completed in 2014. The reports are informing an Action Plan which will be presented to the Executive in January 2015. The reports highlight a number of areas in the borough that are referred to as “hot spots”, which are particularly vulnerable to surface water flooding. Many of these areas suffered badly from flooding during the period of heavy rain last winter. Implementing risk reduction measures to control flooding is necessarily a multi agency task, which could involve private and public watercourses, highway drainage and public sewers. The Council’s responsibility stems from its powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Its key partners in this initiative are Surrey County Council, The Environment Agency and Thames Water. Other significant partners will become involved at appropriate stages. The aim of this project is to promote further flood risk reduction initiatives and projects in conjunction with our partners and to promote joint working. To do this it will be necessary to employ consultants and contractors to undertake investigations, studies and some minor flood risk reduction works. It is hoped that by adopting a joint working approach we will be able to attract funding from central government and elsewhere for major capital investment that has been identified within the plan.

2. Estimated Timetable

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	12	1 April 2015
Contract works	12	1 April 2015

3. Justification for project

The Council is the local flood risk management authority by virtue of the Land Drainage Act 1991. It has a duty to work with Surrey County Council (The Lead Local Flood Authority or LLFA) under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 as well as other flood risk management authorities such as the Environment Agency. The Borough has a number of areas which are particularly vulnerable to flooding as was demonstrated by the flooding of winter 2013-14 and the recent public consultation for the SWMP associated with the Local Plan.

Flood prevention contributes to strategic priorities under all of the fundamental themes of the Corporate Plan. It is essential for public health, promotes and is part of sustainable development, safeguards business and the economy and is a vital part of the borough’s infrastructure.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

Flooding will continue during very wet weather and in some cases may become more frequent and worse.

5. Options

Addressing the issues will require continued investment and joint working with all the key agencies with a robust system of assessing priorities and allocating resources.

6. Consents required:	Yes/No		Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	N	Building Regulations required?	N
Any other consent required?	N		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Land Acquisition						
Contractor Payments	140					140
Consultants Fees	40					40
Salaries: Property Services						
Salaries: Housing Services						
Salaries: Engineers	20					20
Other Fees						
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases						
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	200					200
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	This is an outline estimated figure.					

8. External Funding						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						
Contributions						
Grants						
S106						
Other (please state)						
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?	Not known at this stage.					
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given.			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Works identified from specification	Initial estimate based on judgement but unsupported by detailed costings.	200,000	50
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs	5	5	5	5	5	5
Other costs	20	20	20	20	20	20
Less additional income						
Net additional expenditure/(income)	25	25	25	25	25	25
Please provide further details	Increased maintenance and inspection regime for watercourses required.					

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015-16 TO 2019-20: BID FOR FUNDING

Scheme title	Litter bin replacement programme
Location	
Landowner	

Officer responsible for project	Chris Wheeler
Service Unit responsible for project	Operational Services

Project champion/Councillor (if applicable)	
--	--

1. Description of project

The executive approved a litter bin replacement programme outside of the town centre, primarily in shop front and other high profile areas.

A full audit and programme is being developed in order to provide a capital bid for the 2016-17 year. Given the large number of bins and elderly state of some of our stock, we expect the programme to be extensive, but the final numbers and costs are to be decided.

This programme will involve a review and assessment of our current stock and will look to prioritise higher profile areas such as shop fronts. We will also look to introduce recycling bins and dual use litter and dog bins wherever possible and practicable.

2. Estimated Timetable	Duration (number of months)	Start date (month/year)
Pre-contract, design, procurement etc.	6 months	April 2015
Contract works	6 to 12 months	

3. Justification for project

Our current bins stock is aged and many bins are in need of replacing. Our current budgets are limited and effectively maintain existing stock. There is very limited scope for a major renewal programme. We are using this as an opportunity to refresh and renew our stock, investing in the visual appearance of the bins in high profile locations and also to increase the capacity of residents to recycle more when going about their day to day business.

4. Implications if project not undertaken

The current stock will continue to be maintained and will be replaced at a much slower pace with limited ability to review and install recycling on the go style bins.

5. Options

The project can be scaled and prioritised if necessary

6. Consents required:	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
Planning Permission required?	No	Building Regulations required?	No
Any other consent required?	No		

7. Estimated Gross Cost 2015-16 to 2019-20						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Contractor Payments						
Consultants Fees						
Salaries: Property Services						
Salaries: Housing Services						
Salaries: Engineers						
Other Fees						
Equipment/Vehicle Purchases		200				200
TOTAL CAPITAL COST	0	200	0	0	0	200
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						

8. External Funding:						
Please provide details of any external income or source of funding and whether it is conditional or guaranteed:						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Receipts						
Contributions						
Grants						
S106						
Other (please state)						
Is the estimate based on quotations, detailed knowledge or estimate figure?						
S106 reference number if known						

9. Expected useful life of the asset			
Where the expected lives of each significant component of the asset are different (for example buying a property with a flat roof) both the useful lives and cost of replacing each component part are given			
	Basis of Estimate	Estimated Value (£)	Estimated Life (Years)
Component 1	Manufacturer guarantee on metal body	200000	10
Component 2			

10. Revenue Implications						
	2015-16 £000	2016-17 £000	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	Total £000
Employees' costs						
Other costs						
Less additional income						
Net additional expenditure/(income)						
Please provide further details:	Nil					