

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

Attendees

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

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 • Bid withdrawn 	n/a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

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

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

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

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

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