

When telephoning, please ask for: Member Services
Direct dial 0115 914 8481
Email memberservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: 15 June 2015

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL will be held on Thursday 25 June 2015 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely



Executive Manager Operations and Corporate Governance

AGENDA

Opening Prayer

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of Interest.
3. Minutes

To receive as a correct record the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday 21 May 2015 (pages 1 - 5).

4. Mayor's Announcements.
5. Leader's Announcements
6. Chief Executive's Announcements
7. New Officer Employment Procedure Rules

The report of the Chief Executive is attached (pages 6 - 15).

8. 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme

The report of the Chief Executive is attached (pages 16 - 38).

9. To answer questions under Standing Order 11(2).

Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble in the Nottingham Forest car park adjacent to the main gates.

Toilets are located opposite Committee Room 2.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.



**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL
THURSDAY 21 MAY 2015**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillor R Hetherington - Mayor
Councillor F A Purdue-Horan – Deputy Mayor

Councillors R A Adair, K P Beardsall, N A Brown, M Buckle, B Buschman, R L Butler, H A Chewings, J N Clarke, T Combellack, L B Cooper, J E Cottee, G Davidson, A M Dickinson, M J Edwards, A J Edyvean, J E Greenwood, S J Hull, R A Inglis, Mrs C E M Jeffreys, R M Jones, K A Khan, N C Lawrence, E J Lungley, A MacInnes, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender, S E Mallender, D J Mason, S C Matthews, G S Moore, A L R A Pell, A Phillips, E A Plant, S J Robinson, Mrs J A Smith, J A Stockwood, J E Thurman, R G Upton, D G Wheeler, J G A Wheeler

OFFICERS PRESENT:

D Banks	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
A Graham	Chief Executive
K Marriott	Executive Manager - Transformation
D Mitchell	Executive Manager - Communities
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer
K Powell	Chief Information Officer
P Steed	Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial
D Swaine	Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors J Donoghue and M W Suthers

OPENING PRAYER

The Meeting was led in prayer by the Mayor's Chaplain

1. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 5 March 2015 were received as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

3. Address of the Retiring Mayor

Councillor Hetherington welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially the newly elected Councillors. He updated Members on the number of engagements that he had attended during his year of office. He stated that his last, or 132nd, event had been the official opening of the first artificial clay court in Nottinghamshire. He stated that Rushcliffe had some great sporting facilities and venues.

As Mayor he, and the Mayoress had attended a wide variety of events during the year, especially as the year coincided with the 100th anniversary of the start of World War 1. He said that the funniest event had been the Gang Show by the Nottinghamshire Scouts and Guides. Whilst the most thought provoking had been a visit to the National Holocaust Museum on the 70th anniversary of the Russian army entering Auschwitz. The event that was most profitable for his charity, The Friary, was a musical evening at the Beckett School. He informed Members that the band had waived their fee and that Morrisons had kindly donated the refreshments.

With regard to his charity he thanked all Councillors who had either arranged /supported events. He was pleased to announce that he had raised in excess of £9,000.

Finally, he thanked his wife who had supported him not only as the Mayoress but also his chaplain. He also thanked the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Purdue-Horan, for all his support during the year.

4. Vote of Thanks to the Retiring Mayor

Councillor Clarke proposed a vote of thanks to Councillor Hetherington for his successful year in office as the Mayor. He said that Councillor Hetherington had performed his duties with enthusiasm, commitment and good humour. Referring to the official photo album he highlighted some of the many engagements carried out by the Mayor, including the royal garden party, Proms in the Park, the turf cutting for the new hospital adjacent to Tollerton Airport and visiting The Friary and Ann Bremner MBE, who successfully ran the project. He also thanked Mrs Hetherington for all her support at these occasions and for divine intervention. Finally, he stated that Councillor Hetherington had chaired the Council meetings with fairness and efficiency.

Councillor Clarke then presented Councillor Hetherington with his Past Mayor's Badge, an album of photographs from his year, and a photographic portrait.

Councillors MacInnes, Davidson, Jones and S Mallender endorsed the remarks of Councillor Clarke, and thanked the retiring Mayor for his great work and enthusiasm during his term of office and his fairness at Council meetings. Members felt that The Friary had been an excellent choice as charity and that the money raised would be very beneficial to the disadvantaged, homeless and vulnerable people of the area.

RESOLVED that:

A vote of thanks be accorded to Councillor Hetherington and Mrs Hetherington for the excellent manner in which they had carried out their duties during Councillor Hetherington's year of office as Mayor of the Borough of Rushcliffe.

5. Election of Mayor 2015/16

Nominations were invited for the election of Mayor of the Borough of Rushcliffe for the 2015/16 municipal year.

It was proposed by Councillor Lawrence and seconded by Councillor Mrs Males that Councillor Purdue-Horan be nominated for the Office of Mayor of the Borough for the year 2015/16.

RESOLVED that:

Councillor Francis Purdue-Horan be elected Mayor of the Borough of Rushcliffe for the 2015/16 municipal year.

Councillor Purdue-Horan read and signed the declaration of acceptance of office and after thanking his proposer, seconder and Members, took the Chair and was invested with the Chain of Office by the Retiring Mayor. The Mayor announced his chosen charity for the year, The Stroke Association. He stated that the work of this charity .

6. Election of Deputy Mayor 2015/16

Nominations were invited for the election of Deputy Mayor of the Borough of Rushcliffe for the 2015/16 municipal year.

It was proposed by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor Hull that Councillor Davidson be nominated for the Office of Deputy Mayor of the Borough for the year 2015/16.

On being put to the vote Councillor Davidson was appointed as Deputy Mayor.

RESOLVED that:

Councillor George Davidson be appointed Deputy Mayor of the Borough of Rushcliffe for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

Councillor Davidson read and signed the declaration of acceptance of office and after thanking his proposer, seconder and Members, was invested with his Chain of Office by the Mayor.

7. Appointment of Leader of the Council 2015 - 2019

It was proposed by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor Mason that Councillor Clarke be appointed to the office of Leader of the Council for the period 2015 - 2019.

RESOLVED that –

Councillor J N Clarke be appointed as Leader of the Council for 2015 – 2019.

Following his appointment as Leader, Councillor Clarke reported that his Cabinet would be as set out below:

Councillor J N Clarke	Leader, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Direction
Councillor S J Robinson	Deputy Leader, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Economy
Councillor R L Butler	Portfolio Holder for Sustainability
Councillor J E Cottee	Portfolio Holder for Community Services
Councillor N C Lawrence	Portfolio Holder for Environment
Councillor D J Mason	Portfolio Holder for Safety and Well Being

8. Appointment of Committees and Member Groups 2015/16

It was proposed by Councillor Clarke and seconded by Councillor Robinson that the Membership of the following Committees, Member Groups and Working Groups with Chairmen and Vice Chairmen as set out in the Appendix be appointed for 2015/16.

Councillor Clarke stated that, following discussions, Councillor Khan would be nominated to the Strategic Growth Board instead of Councillor Davidson.

- Community Development Group
- Corporate Governance Group
- Partnership Delivery Group
- Performance Management Board
- Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee
- Development Control Committee
- Employment Appeals Committee
- Interviewing Committee
- Licensing Committee
- Standards Committee
- Local Development Framework Group
- Member Development Group
- Strategic Growth Board
- Civic Hospitality Panel

RESOLVED that:

the nominations as set out in the Appendix to the report be approved.

9. Appointment of Representatives to Outside Bodies 2015/16

Members were informed that there were three contested appointments, the Grantham Canal Partnership – Council of Management, the Leicestershire and Northamptonshire Rail Action Committee and the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group. It was proposed by Councillor Clarke and seconded by Councillor Robinson that the representatives be

appointed to the Outside Bodies as set out in the Appendix to the report, excluding the contested appointment which would be put to the vote.

RESOLVED that:

- a) the appointments to Outside Bodies for 2015/16, excluding the contested appointments, as indicated in the appendix to the report, be approved, and
- b) for the contested appointments
 - i. Councillor R L Butler be appointed as the Council's representative to the Grantham Canal Partnership – Council of Management
 - ii. Councillors N C Lawrence and G R Mallender be appointed as the Council's representatives to the Leicestershire and Northamptonshire Rail Action Committee
 - iii. Councillor N C Lawrence be appointed as the Council's representative to the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm.

MAYOR

Report of the Chief Executive

1. Summary

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to enable the Council to approve the adoption of new legislative standing orders relating to the dismissal of certain statutory officers in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (“the 2015 Regulations”).

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Council

- a) incorporates into its Standing Orders the provisions required by the 2015 Regulations and amends the Officer Employment Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution as shown in **Appendix 1**.
- b) in the event of there being a need to apply the new procedures relating to the dismissal of any of the statutory officers referred to in the report, the Council shall –
 - (i) set up an appropriately constituted Panel having regard to all of the circumstances pertaining and the need for there to be a process which is fair to both the Council and the officer concerned;
 - (ii) comply with the Regulations and the revised Standing Orders; and
 - (iii) give effect to any relevant provision in the officer’s contract.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. The Government shortly before the election passed amending legislation relating to the procedure for dealing with the dismissal of the Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer or the Section 151 Finance Officer. The Council is required to adopt these provisions in its standing orders within the Constitution.

4. Background and Supporting Information

- 4.1. In 2001 the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations (“the 2001 Regulations”) required the Council to adopt a series of standing orders relating to the appointment and dismissal of Council officers. The current

Officer Employment Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution complied with this requirement.

- 4.2. Under the previous rules no disciplinary action could be taken by the Council against its three statutory officers (head of paid service, section 151 officer and monitoring officer) unless “in accordance with a recommendation in a report made by a designated independent person” appointed under the Regulations. This procedure has been replaced with new procedures contained within the 2015 Regulations.
- 4.3. The new rules remove the requirement for a designated independent person with effect from 11 May 2015 and state that any decision to dismiss the relevant statutory officer has to be taken by the full Council. The Council must, in doing so, consider any recommendations from an independent Panel, the conclusions of any investigation into the proposed dismissal and any representations from the officer concerned.
- 4.4. The Regulations go on to provide that, in constituting the independent Panel, the Council must invite ‘relevant independent persons’ to be considered for appointment to the Panel.
- 4.5. The Panel must include at least two independent persons invited in the following priority order –
 - A relevant independent person appointed by the authority who is a local government elector for its area
 - Any other independent person appointed by the authority
 - A relevant independent person who has been appointed by another authority
- 4.7. The Panel must be appointed at least 20 working days before the date of the Council meeting at which the decision whether to dismiss the officer is to be taken, although the Regulations are silent as to when and how many times the Panel should meet.
- 4.8. The legislation expressly provides that the Panel constitutes an advisory committee under section 102 of the Local Government Act 1972. Such committees may include persons who are not elected members. All members of the Panel would have voting rights under the 1972 Act. The Council would therefore have the option to constitute a Panel comprising wholly independent persons or a Panel comprising a mix of independent persons and elected members.
- 4.9. There is no requirement for the independent Panel to be a standing committee of the Council and it is not therefore necessary for the Council to appoint a Panel at this time. The composition of the Panel would need to be carefully considered to ensure fairness to both parties.
- 4.10. It is therefore recommended that at this stage the Council simply gives effect to the requirements of the Regulations to incorporate the new rules into its Standing Orders. Accordingly, the Officer Employment Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution have been redrafted to comply with the current Regulations and these are now reproduced as **Appendix 1**. The opportunity

has also been taken to update these Rules to reflect changes to senior management structures and post titles.

5. Risk and Uncertainties

- 5.1. Failure to implement the new statutory requirements would mean that the Constitution was not legally compliant.

6. Implications

6.1. Finance

There are no direct costs arising from this report but the Regulations allow an authority to remunerate an independent person appointed to the Panel, provided that the amount paid does not exceed the level of remuneration which that person receives as an independent person under the Localism Act.

6.2. Legal

The legal implications have already been addressed in the main part of the report.

6.3. Corporate Priorities

There are no implications for the Council's corporate priorities

6.4. Other Implications

None.

For more information contact:	Name: Allen Graham Job title: Chief Executive 0115 914 8519 email agraham@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	2015 Regulations (see paragraph 1.1) Officer Employment Procedure Rules
List of appendices (if any):	Appendix 1 – Revised Officer Employment Procedure Rules

PROCEDURE RULES

OFFICER EMPLOYMENT

These procedure rules incorporate (in paragraphs 5 to 10) the provisions which authorities are required to include in their Standing Orders relating to staff under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 (as amended) and shall be interpreted in accordance with those Regulations.

1. Recruitment and Appointment

(a) Declarations

- (i) The Council will draw up a statement requiring any candidate for appointment as an officer to state in writing whether they are related to an existing Councillor or senior officer of the Council; or of the partner of such persons.
- (ii) No candidate so related to a Councillor or a senior officer will be appointed without the authority of the Chief Executive or an officer nominated by him/her.

(b) Seeking support for appointment

- (i) Subject to (iii), the Council will disqualify any applicant who directly or indirectly seeks the support of any Councillor for any appointment with the Council. The content of this paragraph will be included in any recruitment information.
- (ii) Subject to paragraph (iii), no Councillor will seek support for any person for any appointment with the Council.
- (iii) This would not preclude a Councillor from providing an official reference for an applicant, provided the Councillor did not participate or seek to influence in any other way in the appointment.

2. Recruitment of Head of Paid Service and Executive Managers

Where the Council proposes to appoint a Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive or Executive Manager it should determine the scope of intended applicants, and whether the stated post(s) should be advertised internally, externally or both.

In all cases, the Council will:

- (a) draw up a statement specifying:

- (i) the duties of the officer concerned; and
 - (ii) any qualifications or qualities to be sought in the person to be appointed;
- (b) make arrangements for the post to be advertised in such a way as is likely to bring it to the attention of persons who are qualified to apply for it; and
 - (c) make arrangements for a copy of the statement mentioned in paragraph (a) to be sent to any person on request.

3. Appointment of Head of Paid Service, Monitoring officer and Section 151 officer

The full Council or a committee appointed by the Council for this purpose will approve the appointment of the head of paid service, and designation of the roles of Monitoring officer and the Section 151 officer.

4. Appointment of Executive Managers

A committee of the Council will appoint Executive Managers.

5. Appointment of Head of Paid Service and Dismissal of Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer

- (1) Where a committee, sub-committee or officer is discharging, on behalf of the Council, the function of the appointment of an officer designated as head of the Council's paid service, the Council's Section 151 officer, or the Council's monitoring officer, the Council must approve that appointment before an offer of appointment is made to that person.
- (2) Where a committee, sub-committee or officer is discharging, on behalf of the Council, the function of the dismissal of an officer designated as the Council's head of paid service, as the Council's Section 151 officer, or as the Council's monitoring officer, the Council must approve that dismissal before notice is given to that person.

6. Notification Procedures – Appointments

- (1) In this paragraph, "appointor" means, in relation to the appointment of a person as an officer of the authority, the Council, where a committee, sub-committee or officer is discharging the function of appointment on behalf of the Council, that committee, sub-committee or officer, as the case may be.
- (2) An offer of an appointment as an officer referred to in the Appendix must not be made by the appointor until–

- (a) the appointor has notified the proper officer of the name of the person to whom the appointor wishes to make the offer and any other particulars which the appointor considers are relevant to the appointment;
- (b) The proper officer has notified every Member of the Cabinet of-
 - (i) the name of the person to whom the appointor wishes to make the offer;
 - (ii) any other particulars relevant to the appointment which the appointor has notified to the proper officer; and
 - (iii) the period within which any objection to the making of the offer is to be made by the Leader on behalf of the Cabinet to the proper officer; and
- (c) either-
 - (i) the Leader has, within the period specified in the notice under sub-paragraph (b) (iii), notified the appointor that neither he nor any other Member of the Cabinet has any objection to the making of the offer;
 - (ii) the proper officer has notified the appointor that no objection was received by him within that period from the Leader; or
 - (iii) the appointor is satisfied that any objection received from the Leader within that period is not material or is not well-founded.

7. Notification Procedures – Dismissals

1. In this paragraph, “dismissor” means, in relation to the dismissal of an officer of the authority, the authority or, where a committee, sub-committee or another officer is discharging the function of dismissal on behalf of the Council, that committee, sub-committee or other officer, as the case may be.
2. Notice of the dismissal of an officer referred to in the Appendix must not be given by the dismissor until-
 - (a) the dismissor has notified the proper officer of the name of the person who the dismissor wishes to dismiss and any other particulars which the dismissor considers are relevant to the dismissal;

- (b) the proper officer has notified every Member of the Cabinet of-
 - A. the name of the person who the dismissor wishes to dismiss;
 - B. any other particulars relevant to the dismissal which the dismissor has notified to the proper officer; and
 - C. the period within which any objection to the dismissal is to be made by the Leader on behalf of the Cabinet to the proper officer; and
- (c) either-
 - A. the Leader has, within the period specified in the notice under sub-paragraph (b) (iii), notified the dismissor that neither he nor any other Member of the Cabinet has any objection to the dismissal;
 - B. the proper officer has notified the dismissor that no objection was received by him within that period from the Leader; or
 - C. the dismissor is satisfied that any objection received from the Leader within that period is not material or is not well-founded.

8. **Cabinet Member on Committees**

Where a committee or sub-committee is discharging, on behalf of the Council, the function of the appointment or dismissal of any officer referred to in the Appendix, at least one member of the Cabinet must be a member of the committee or sub-committee.

9. **Member Involvement**

- (a) Save as provided for in sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) below, the function of the appointment and dismissal of, and taking disciplinary action against, a member of staff must be discharged, on behalf of the Council, by the head of paid service or by an officer nominated by him.
- (b) The above requirement shall not apply to the appointment or dismissal of, or disciplinary action against an officer referred to in the Appendix.
- (c) Sub-paragraph (a) above shall not prevent any Member from serving as a member of the Employment Appeals Committee.

10. **Dismissal of Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer**

1. In the following paragraphs –

- (a) “the 2011 Act” means the Localism Act 2011.
- (b) “chief finance officer”, “disciplinary action”, “head of the authority’s paid service” and “monitoring officer” have the same meaning as in regulation 2 of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001;
- (c) “independent person” means a person appointed under section 28(7) of the 2011 Act;
- (d) “local government elector” means a person registered as a local government elector in the register of electors in the authority’s area in accordance with the Representation of the People Acts;
- (e) “the Panel” means a committee appointed by the authority under section 102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 for the purposes of advising the authority on matters relating to the dismissal of relevant officers of the authority;
- (f) “relevant meeting” means a meeting of the authority to consider whether or not to approve a proposal to dismiss a relevant officer; and
- (g) “relevant officer” means the chief finance officer, head of the authority’s paid service or monitoring officer, as the case may be.

2. A relevant officer may not be dismissed by an authority unless the procedure set out in the following paragraphs is complied with.

3. The authority must invite relevant independent persons to be considered for appointment to the Panel, with a view to appointing at least two such persons to the Panel.

4. In paragraph 3 “relevant independent person” means any independent person who has been appointed by the authority or, where there are fewer than two such persons, such independent persons as have been appointed by another authority or authorities as the authority considers appropriate.

5. Subject to paragraph 6, the authority must appoint to the Panel such relevant independent persons who have accepted an invitation issued in accordance with paragraph 3 in accordance with the following priority order –

- (a) a relevant independent person who has been appointed by the authority and who is a local government elector;
- (b) any other relevant independent person who has been appointed by the authority;
- (c) a relevant independent person who has been appointed by another authority or authorities.

6. An authority is not required to appoint more than two relevant independent persons in accordance with paragraph 5 but may do so.
7. The authority must appoint any Panel at least 20 working days before the relevant meeting.
8. Before the taking of a vote at the relevant meeting on whether or not to approve such a dismissal, the authority must take into account, in particular –
 - (a) any advice, views or recommendations of the Panel;
 - (b) the conclusions of any investigation into the proposed dismissal; and
 - (c) any representations from the relevant officer.
9. Any remuneration, allowances or fees paid by the authority to an independent person appointed to the Panel must not exceed the level of remuneration, allowances or fees payable to that independent person in respect of that person's role as independent person under the 2011 Act.

APPENDIX

The posts listed in paragraph 3 of Part II of Schedule 1 to the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) regulations 2001, namely:

- (a) The Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive)
- (b) Statutory chief officer (Section 151 officer)
- (c) Non-statutory chief officer (Executive Managers)
- (d) Deputy chief officer (Lead Specialists)
- (e) Assistant for a political group

Note: the above posts are defined more specifically in the Regulations and the Strategic Human Resources Manager will be able to advise which posts on the establishment fall within the definitions.

Report of the Chief Executive

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report proposes amendments to the 2015/16 Capital Programme requested by Cabinet on 9 June 2015. If agreed these changes will result in the five year Capital Programme increasing by £1.28m (3.6%) from its current £35.85m to £37.13m.

2 Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council agrees the revised Capital Programme for 2015/16 to 2019/20 to £37.13m as detailed at **Appendix B**.

3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 Following the conclusion of the tender submission in respect of the Arena redevelopment, it has been identified that the level of resource allocated to the project in the 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme is insufficient to cover all potential contingencies and identified internal and external costs.
- 3.2 For the majority of schemes such variations would be managed from within the overall level of resources allocated to the Capital Programme including Capital Contingencies. However having considered the significance and complexity of the project, along with the potential impact of remodelling on the resultant facility, it is more appropriate for the Capital Programme to be amended enabling the Council to progress with its intended programme centred around a joint leisure, civic and office facility at the Arena site.

4 Supporting Information

- 4.1 The current Capital Programme approved by Council on 5 March 2015 is attached at **Appendix A** and summarised below. Further context on specific schemes is also provided in the Project Appraisals at **Appendix C** which were previously considered and agreed by Council as part of the Annual Budget Report on 5 March 2015.

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000
Transformation	682	1,543	2,500	0	0	4,725
Neighbourhoods	1,741	1,555	1,167	920	939	6,322
Communities	200	200	110	110	110	730
Corporate Governance	369	77	55	110	121	732
Finance and Commercial	6,105	6,025	810	250	150	13,340
Total Service Allocations	9,097	9,400	4,642	1,390	1,320	25,849
Investment Strategy	£10m allocation not yet programmed by service or year					10,000
Total Capital Programme						35,849

4.2 As detailed in the revised Programme detailed at **Appendix B** it is proposed to make amendments to allocations for the Arena project increasing the total capital allocation from £14.2m to £15.48m the impact of which is summarised below. It should be noted that the figures for the Arena at **Appendices A and B** exclude £2.02m of funding for this project which was included in the 2014/15 Capital Programme.

	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000
Transformation	682	1,543	2,500	0	0	4,725
Neighbourhoods	1,741	1,555	1,167	920	939	6,322
Communities	200	200	110	110	110	730
Corporate Governance	369	77	55	110	121	732
Finance and Commercial	6,605	6,705	910	250	150	14,620
Total Service Allocations	9,597	10,080	4,742	1,390	1,320	27,129
Investment Strategy	£10m allocation not yet programmed by service or year					10,000
Total Capital Programme						37,129

4.3 It is proposed that this increase will be funded equally through the allocation of an additional £640,000 of reserves and the same amount financed through internal borrowing (i.e. utilisation of internal cashflow) which will be repaid through future New Homes Bonus receipts. The impact of these changes are also shown at **Appendix B**.

4.4 It should be noted that such changes will also impact upon elements of the Treasury Management Strategy including the Council's Prudential Indicators. Details of this will be reported to the Corporate Governance Group, who scrutinise this aspect on behalf of Council, in both the 2015/16 Six Monthly Treasury Management Update and the 2016/17 Treasury Management Strategy Reports.

5 Other Options Considered

5.1 Council could determine that it does not wish to make the requested changes to the 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme. Were this to be the case then a further decision would be required by the Cabinet on whether it wished to proceed with the Arena redevelopment in its current form and, if so, what

design compromises would be acceptable to deliver the scheme within the funding envelope agreed by Council.

6 Risk and Uncertainties

- 6.1 The costs of capital schemes are dependent upon the prevailing market conditions. By agreeing to amend the Capital Programme as proposed in this report Council would be ensuring that contingency funding currently allocated is not eroded by the needs of the Arena redevelopment and remains available to meet additional cost pressures and urgent requirements.

7 Implications

7.1 Finance

7.1.1 These are dealt with in the main body of the report and the appendices. It should be noted that, due to the timing of this report, work will have commenced on some of the schemes detailed at **Appendices A and B**. In addition allocations do not include any adjustments resulting from the 2014/15 Capital Programme, the outturn of which will be considered by Cabinet on 21 July 2015.

7.1.2 It should be noted that funding for the Investment Strategy will only be allocated to service areas and financial years once individual schemes, opportunities and business cases are approved. As a result costs and resultant funding needs are shown as a global allocation within the five year Capital Programme.

7.2 Legal

7.2.1 None in this report.

7.3 Corporate Priorities

7.3.1 The Capital Programme provides funding for the Council to meet its key priorities and wider needs of the Borough.

7.4 Other Implications

7.4.1 None in this report.

For more information contact:	Name: Peter Steed Executive Manager -Finance and Commercial 0115 914 8567 email psteed@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	
List of appendices (if any):	A. Current 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme B. Proposed 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme C. Project Appraisals

Appendix A
Current 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme
Agreed by Council 5th March 2015

Scheme	Ref	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000	
Transformation								
Colliers Way Industrial Units	1	20	0	0	0	0	20	
Cotgrave Town Centre Regeneration	2	0	300	0	0	0	300	
Bridgford Hall Refurbishment	3	500	1,160	0	0	0	1,660	
Nottinghamshire Broadband	4	162	83	0	0	0	245	
New Depot		0	0	2,500	0	0	2,500	
Sub total		682	1,543	2,500	0	0	4,725	
Neighbourhoods								
Wheeled Bins	5	60	60	60	60	60	300	
Vehicle Replacement	6	877	870	482	235	392	2,856	
Support for Registered Housing Providers		369	250	250	250	112	1,231	
Hound Lodge Enhancements	7	60	0	0	0		60	
Disabled Facilities Grants		375	375	375	375	375	1,875	
Sub total		1,741	1,555	1,167	920	939	6,322	
Communities								
Capital Grant Funding		60	60	60	60	60	300	
Nottinghamshire Cricket Club Grant		90	90	0	0	0	180	
Play Areas - Special Expense	8	0	50	50	50	50	200	
Alford Road Fencing/Infrastructure (Spec Exp)	9	50	0	0	0	0	50	
Sub total		200	200	110	110	110	730	
Corporate Governance								
Information Systems Strategy	10	369	77	55	110	121	732	
Sub total		369	77	55	110	121	732	
Finance and Commercial								
BLC Floodlights	11	50	0	0	0	0	50	
BLC Artificial Turf Pitch		0	0	165	0	0	165	
KLC Pool Filters		0	0	20	0	0	20	
CLC Pool Handling Ventilation System		0	0	0	100	0	100	
EGC Upgrade Facilities		0	0	75	0	0	75	
Arena Development	12	5,905	5,875	400	0	0	12,180	
Contingency		150	150	150	150	150	750	
Sub total		6,105	6,025	810	250	150	13,340	
TOTAL SERVICE ALLOCATIONS		9,097	9,400	4,642	1,390	1,320	25,849	
Investment Strategy								
Investment Strategy	13	£10m allocation not yet programmed by year						10,000
Sub total							10,000	
PROGRAMME TOTAL							35,849	
Funded By								
Usable Capital Receipts		(2,061)	(2,688)	(3,900)	(1,048)	(978)	(10,675)	
Disabled Facilities Grants		(292)	(292)	(292)	(292)	(292)	(1,460)	
Use of Reserves		(2,732)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)	(2,932)	
Grants and Contributions		(500)	(495)	0	0	0	(995)	
Section 106 Monies		(87)	0	0	0	0	(87)	
Internal Borrowing		(3,425)	(5,875)	(400)	0	0	(9,700)	
TOTAL FUNDING		(9,097)	(9,400)	(4,642)	(1,390)	(1,320)	(25,849)	
External Borrowing							(10,000)	
TOTAL FUNDING ALLOCATION							(35,849)	

Appendix B
Proposed 2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme

Scheme	Ref	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000	
Transformation								
Colliers Way Industrial Units	1	20	0	0	0	0	20	
Cotgrave Town Centre Regeneration	2	0	300	0	0	0	300	
Bridgford Hall Refurbishment	3	500	1,160	0	0	0	1,660	
Nottinghamshire Broadband	4	162	83	0	0	0	245	
New Depot		0	0	2,500	0	0	2,500	
Sub total		682	1,543	2,500	0	0	4,725	
Neighbourhoods								
Wheeled Bins	5	60	60	60	60	60	300	
Vehicle Replacement	6	877	870	482	235	392	2,856	
Support for Registered Housing Providers		369	250	250	250	112	1,231	
Hound Lodge Enhancements	7	60	0	0	0		60	
Disabled Facilities Grants		375	375	375	375	375	1,875	
Sub total		1,741	1,555	1,167	920	939	6,322	
Communities								
Capital Grant Funding		60	60	60	60	60	300	
Nottinghamshire Cricket Club Grant		90	90	0	0	0	180	
Play Areas - Special Expense	8	0	50	50	50	50	200	
Alford Road Fencing/Infrastructure (Spec Exp)	9	50	0	0	0	0	50	
Sub total		200	200	110	110	110	730	
Corporate Governance								
Information Systems Strategy	10	369	77	55	110	121	732	
Sub total		369	77	55	110	121	732	
Finance and Commercial								
BLC Floodlights	11	50	0	0	0	0	50	
BLC Artificial Turf Pitch		0	0	165	0	0	165	
KLC Pool Filters		0	0	20	0	0	20	
CLC Pool Handling Ventilation System		0	0	0	100	0	100	
EGC Upgrade Facilities		0	0	75	0	0	75	
Arena Development	12	6,405	6,555	500	0	0	13,460	
Contingency		150	150	150	150	150	750	
Sub total		6,605	6,705	910	250	150	14,620	
TOTAL SERVICE ALLOCATIONS		9,597	10,080	4,742	1,390	1,320	27,129	
Investment Strategy								
Investment Strategy	13	£10m allocation not yet programmed by year						10,000
Sub total								10,000
PROGRAMME TOTAL		9,597	10,080	4,742	1,390	1,320	27,129	
Funded By								
Usable Capital Receipts		(2,061)	(2,688)	(3,900)	(1,048)	(978)	(10,675)	
Disabled Facilities Grants		(292)	(292)	(292)	(292)	(292)	(1,460)	
Use of Reserves		(2,982)	(390)	(100)	(50)	(50)	(3,572)	
Grants and Contributions		(500)	(495)	0	0	0	(995)	
Section 106 Monies		(87)	0	0	0	0	(87)	
Internal Borrowing		(3,675)	(6,215)	(450)	0	0	(10,340)	
TOTAL FUNDING		(9,597)	(10,080)	(4,742)	(1,390)	(1,320)	(27,129)	
External Borrowing								(10,000)
TOTAL FUNDING ALLOCATION								(37,129)

Appendix C
2015/16 to 2019/20 Capital Programme Project Appraisals

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Colliers Way Industrial Units		Cost Centre: 0368	Ref: 1
Detailed Description: The 4 units at Colliers Way do not currently have mains sewerage, gas or Broadband. An opportunity has arisen to address this by commissioning Barratts to connect up the units whilst they are carrying out their work to implement these services on the wider development. It is unlikely that the cost of this work will be able to be reclaimed through existing tenants' rents or service charges but, it may mean that future tenants will be able to pay a higher rent if this can be negotiated.			
Location: Colliers Way, Cotgrave		Head of Service: Transformation	
Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient, high quality services. • Supporting economic growth to ensure a sustainable, prosperous and thriving local economy by ensuring that our industrial stock is of a high standard. 			
Community Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property owned by the Council is used to generate income for the Council enabling it to keep Council Tax as low as possible. • The Borough is a more prosperous area with improved employment opportunities and thriving local businesses. 			
Other Options Rejected and Why: By not undertaking the suggested works, the units run the risk of becoming out-dated and undesirable which may, in turn, lead to a downturn in their income generation capacity.			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M			
Start Date: July 2015		Completion Date: December 2015	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1:15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
£20,000	£20,000	£0	
Capital Cost (Breakdown) £:			
Works £20,000	Equipment	Other	Fees
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16		Year 2: 16/17
Year 3: 17/18	Year 4: 18/19		Year 5: 19/20
Proposed Funding			
External:		Internal: Capital Receipts	
Useful Economic Life (years): 5		New/Replacement: New	
Depreciation per annum: £4,000		Capital Financing Costs: £150 p.a.	
Residual Value: N/A		Category of Asset: Infrastructure	

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Cotgrave Town Centre Regeneration		Cost Centre: 0348	Ref: 2
Detailed Description: Provision of £300,000 in 2016/17 is provisionally earmarked as a contribution for the development of a Customer Service Point in Cotgrave as part of the creation of a multi-service centre. It is hoped that this centre will facilitate partnership working with Nottinghamshire County Council, GPs, NHS, the Police and RBC. It is a key part of the wider regeneration scheme planned for Cotgrave and linked to the housing growth in the town.			
Location: Cotgrave		Executive Manager: Transformation	
Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Supporting economic growth. Strategic Task: Develop the use of technology to improve customer access and reduce costs by working in partnership to share staff, applications and best practice. Delivery of regeneration of Cotgrave town centre			
Community Outcomes: Residents are able to access Council services and information at convenient locations. Supports the regeneration of Cotgrave town centre.			
Other Options Rejected and Why: Failure to provide investment to develop strategic remote Customer Contact Centres will not satisfy the Council's aim to improve access to its services or to be able to work collaboratively to improve service delivery.			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): H			
Start Date: April 2016		Completion Date: March 2017	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
£300,000		£300,000	
Capital Cost (Breakdown):			
Works	Equipment	Other £300,000	Fees
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
	£0	£0	
Year 3: 17/18	Year 4: 18/19	Year 5: 19/20	
£0	£0	£0	
Proposed Funding			
External: N/A		Internal: Capital Receipts	
Useful Economic Life (years): to be determined		New/Replacement: New	
Depreciation per annum: to be determined		Capital Financing Costs: £2,280	
Residual Value: N/A		Category of Asset: to be determined potentially Operational Land and Buildings	

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Bridgford Hall Refurbishment	Cost Centre: 0382	Ref: 3	
<p>Detailed Description: Bridgford Hall is a Grade II listed building, owned by the Borough Council. It has been leased to Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) who have now vacated but wish to return in Jan 2017 to operate the registry office from the building. A tenant has been secured to operate an aparthotel in the rest of the building. The Council also has an obligation to ensure the building is appropriately maintained as a Grade II listed property. Following their temporary vacation of the building, NCC has agreed to make a contribution to the dilapidations of £150,000. A successful application has been made to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for a major grant towards the cost of this refurbishment project. The sum of £1,495,000 has been awarded. Proposed works include: refurbishment of the building, conversion of the first and second floors to 7 apartments, small extension to include a lift.</p>			
Location: West Bridgford Town Centre	Executive Manager: Transformation		
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Strategic Task: Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio.</p>			
<p>Community Outcomes: Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council enabling it to keep Council Tax as low as possible.</p>			
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why: The option of not carrying out any works will result in this asset falling into serious disrepair, thus making the asset uninhabitable for occupation and unable to generate an income stream.</p>			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): H			
Start Date: April 2015		Completion Date: Jan 2017	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Prior Year	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17
£2,310,000	£650,000	£500,000	£1,160,000
Capital Cost (Breakdown) :			
Works £2,060,000	Equipment £0	Other £0	Fees £250,000
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16 £0		Year 2: 16/17 £0
Year 3: 17/18 (£120,000)	Year 4: 18/16 (£120,000)		Year 5: 19/20 (£120,000)

Proposed Funding	
<p>External: Contribution Nottinghamshire County Council £150,000 Heritage Lottery Fund £1,495,000</p>	<p>Internal: Capital Receipts £665,000</p>
Useful Economic Life (years): 25	New/Replacement: Replacement
Depreciation per annum: N/A	Capital Financing Costs: £17,560
Residual Value: N/A	Category of Asset: Investment Property

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Nottinghamshire Broadband	Cost Centre: 0410	Ref: 4
<p>Detailed Description: Capital contribution towards Nottinghamshire County Council led project to provide Broadband infrastructure across Rushcliffe. This is to upgrade telecoms cabinets across the county where it is not commercially viable for the private sector to do so (i.e. there is market failure). The whole project is anticipated to cost £17m county wide. This comprises £4.25m public sector funding from NCC and the districts, £4.25m public sector funding from Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) and £8.5m from the Private Sector. Rushcliffe Borough Council has been asked to contribute £245,000 to the project. This has been calculated based on the number of premises in Rushcliffe that currently do not have access to superfast broadband – around 13,000. NCC will lead on procuring the private sector delivery partner. It is proposed that £152,000 is provided from the LAA reward grant and £93,000 is provided from the Council's own capital resources.</p>		
Location: Rushcliffe	Executive Manager: Transformation	
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Supporting economic growth to ensure a sustainable, prosperous and thriving local economy. Strategic Task: Develop the use of technology to improve customer/business access.</p>		
<p>Community Outcomes: Residents/businesses are able to access Council and other services as Broadband will be available for all Rushcliffe residents and businesses if they choose to purchase it.</p>		
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why: Failure to take up this investment opportunity will lead to Rushcliffe Borough falling behind other Districts in relation to Broadband infrastructure. This could lead to economic decline as businesses and potentially residents move elsewhere to access broadband.</p>		
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M		
Start Date: Whole project 2013/14		Completion Date: Whole project 2015/16
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17
£245,000	£162,000	£83,000
Capital Cost (Breakdown):		
Works	Equipment	Other £245,000
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16 £0	Year 2: 16/17 £0
Year 3: 17/18 £0	Year 4: 18/19 £0	Year 5: 19/20 £0

Proposed Funding	
External: LAA Reward Grant £152,000	Internal: Capital Receipts £93,000

Useful Economic Life (years): N/A	New/Replacement: New
Depreciation per annum: N/A	Capital Financing Costs: £1,860
Residual Value: N/A	Category of Asset: Revenue expenditure funded from capital under Statute

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Wheeled Bins		Cost Centre: 0310	Ref: 5
Detailed Description: This funding is used to facilitate the provision and replacement programme for domestic wheeled bins for all residents across the Borough. All wheeled bins are fixed assets which have a finite lifespan and it is important that the Council maintains a programme which also deals with bins that become defective through accidental damage or loss. Looking into the future, work will commence to explore the opportunity to charge developers for the cost of providing wheeled bins for residual waste on new developments. If this is a feasible option, a revised programme will be put forward for future years.			
Location: Central Works Depot/Borough		Executive Manager: Neighbourhoods	
Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Strategic Task: Examine the future viability of all Council owned property including equipment.			
Community Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents of the Borough continue to receive the council services they require. • Residents provided with wheeled bins that are in good repair and condition resulting in high standards of customer satisfaction. • Compliance with health and safety legislation as it is important that operatives do not empty bins that are damaged or defective. 			
Other Options Rejected and Why: Failure to invest in new wheeled bins could give rise to health and safety issues for residents and staff. Customer satisfaction may be affected giving rise to additional complaints to the Council.			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L			
Start Date: Ongoing		Completion Date: Ongoing	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
£120,000 (2 years)	£60,000	£60,000	
Capital Cost (Breakdown)			
Works £0	Equipment £120,000	Other £0	Fees £0
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16 £0	Year 2: 16/17 £0	
Year 3: 17/18 £0	Year 4: 18/19 £0	Year 5: 19/2 £0	

Proposed Funding	
External: N/A	Internal: Capital Receipts
Useful Economic Life (years): 10	New/Replacement: New/Replacement
Depreciation per annum: £6,000 p.a.	Capital Financing Costs: £460 p.a.
Residual Value: N/A	Category of Asset: Equipment

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Vehicle Replacement	Cost Centre: 0680	Ref: 6
<p>Detailed Description: The authority owns vehicles ranging from large refuse freighters to small vans and items of mechanical plant. As these vehicles and plant age and become uneconomic to maintain and run, they are replaced on a new for old basis. Although there is a programme for replacements for the next ten years, each vehicle or machine is assessed annually and the programme continually adjusted to take into account actual performance. This provision will be used to acquire new vehicles and plant, undertake refurbishments to extend vehicle life and value and to purchase second hand vehicles and plant as and when appropriate.</p> <p>For 2014/15 onwards the programme has been significantly revised to take into account the creation of Streetwise Environmental Limited in 2014 which has now taken on the ownership and replacement of the existing Streetwise fleet of equipment and vehicles.</p>		
Location: Central Works Depot	Executive Manager: Neighbourhoods	
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Strategic Task: Examine the future viability of all Council owned property including vehicles and plant to maximise the potential of the Council's portfolio. To work in close alignment with the Council's Transformation Programme in order to deliver services more efficiently. To reduce waste and increasingly reuse and recycle to protect the environment for the future. The replacement of vehicles is critical to the performance of the front line services. Regular vehicle and plant replacement with new updated engines helps to meet climate change and national indicator targets for emissions and helps maintain a cleaner air quality within the Borough.</p>		
<p>Community Outcomes: Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential. The introduction of new euro standard engines will lower emissions. The new vehicles will also reduce maintenance costs on the vehicles they replace however it should be noted that the remainder of the fleet ages and therefore the fleet profile and maintenance costs overall remain stable.</p>		
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why: In 2004, the authority considered the leasing and hiring in of vehicles. The conclusion was that it was uneconomic to do either of the two options. There are also distinct advantages in direct purchase:- a) The authority has control over the maintenance of the vehicles. b) It is difficult to change the terms and conditions of a lease. c) High performing vehicles can have their lifespan lengthened. d) Poor performing vehicles can have their lifespan shortened. Not being tied in to lengthy lease/hire contracts means the service can react and adapt to change quickly. The Council now actively looks at the possible purchase of 2nd hand vehicles and will refurbish vehicles to extend their life and value.</p>		
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L		
Start Date: Ongoing		Completion Date:
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17
£1,747,000 (2 years)	£877,000	£870,000

Capital Cost (Breakdown)			
Works £0	Equipment £1,747,000	Other £0	Fees £0
Revenue cost per annum :		Year 1: 15/16 £0	Year 2: 16/17 £0
Year 3: 17/18 £0		Year 4: 18/19 £0	Year 5: 19/20 £0
As each vehicle replaces an existing vehicle there is no increase in the running costs the fleet profile remains constant, service budgets remain the same.			
Proposed Funding:			
External: N/A		Internal: Capital Receipts	
Useful Economic Life (years): Various		New/Replacements: New and Replacements	
Depreciation per annum: Various		Capital Financing Costs: £13,280	
Residual Value: Various		Category of Asset: Vehicle and Plant	

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Hound Lodge Enhancements	Cost Centre: 0308	Ref: 7
<p>Detailed Description: Replacement of windows, kitchens and sanitary ware at Hound Lodge. Hound Lodge is the Council's temporary accommodation for homeless families whom the Council has a duty to accommodate. It consists of sixteen flats, which share kitchen and bathroom facilities, one between each pair of flats.</p> <p>N.B. further, less urgent works are planned for 2016/17 (£16,000) and 2017/18 (£19,000), and will be proposed for inclusion in the maintenance revenue budget in those years. This appraisal covers only capital works proposed for 2015/16.</p>		
Location: Hound Road, West Bridgford	Head of Service: Neighbourhoods	
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Investing in and extending the useful life of Hound Lodge will contribute to the following objectives of the Council's Corporate Strategy 2012 – 2016:</p> <p>Corporate themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life. • Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. <p>Strategic tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver the Council's Four Year Plan to reduce costs, generate income and adopt more effective delivery models. • Examine the future viability of all Council owned property including equipment. 		
<p>Community Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windows replaced with new, efficient uPVC units in 10no bedrooms, 3no kitchens and the health visitor's office. • 9no sets of kitchen units replaced. • WC seats and bathroom taps replaced throughout building, and 4no wash hand basins replaced in annexe flats. <p>The overall outcome will be a building with modern, safe facilities, allowing the Council to meet its duty to provide suitable temporary accommodation for homeless people, and to continue to generate income by letting vacancies to neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Other Options Rejected and Why: Failing to replace building elements that are at the end of their useful life will lead to increasing expenditure on day to day maintenance budgets. Kitchens and bathrooms that are degrading over time are more likely to harbour infectious pathogens, which is a potential risk in a building that is home to a number of young children, babies and pregnant women. Allowing windows to fail would be a security risk, and potentially a physical risk to young children, as well as increasing the cost to the Council of heating the premises.</p> <p>Ultimately, failing to invest in the building would lead to its deterioration to the point that it could no longer be considered suitable accommodation within the meaning provided by homelessness legislation. This would have two significant financial risks. First, neighbouring authorities that currently refer homeless households to vacancies at Hound Lodge may stop doing so, reducing the income generated. Second, there would be the risk of a legal challenge from an applicant who considers the accommodation to be unsuitable. As well as the costs involved, this could require the Council to source alternative temporary accommodation for them, which is likely to be very costly, and a poor use of resources compared to investing in the existing asset.</p>		
Risk Rating (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): Low		
Start Date: 1 April 2015	Completion Date: 31 March 2016	

Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
£60,000	£60,000		
Capital Cost (Breakdown) £:			
Works £54,000	Equipment	Other	Fees £6,000
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 14/15 £0	Year 2: 15/16 £0	
Year 3: 16/17 £0	Year 4: 17/18 £0	Year 5: 18/19 £0	
Proposed Funding			
External:		Internal: Capital Receipts	
Useful Economic Life (years):		New/Replacement: Replacement	
Depreciation per annum:		Capital Financing Costs: £460	
Residual Value:		Category of Asset: Operational Land and Buildings	

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Play Areas (Special Expense Area)		Cost Centre: 0664	Ref: 8
Detailed Description: In 2016/17 the focus will be on undertaking consultation with users of the Boundary Road wooden cycle track to establish whether to remove and replace with grass or replace with a small gravel cycle track. In addition, the aim is to replace the worn out carpeted football five a side facility at Greythorne Drive and replace with a robust and low maintenance multi-use games area.			
Location: Greythorne Drive, Compton Acres		Executive Manager: Communities	
Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life. Strategic Task: a) Facilitate activities for Children and Young People to enable them to reach their potential. b) Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities			
Community Outcomes: Residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities supporting them to lead healthy and active lifestyles. Young people living in the Borough are healthy, active, confident, and engaged in the communities they live in.			
Other Options Rejected and Why: Doing nothing would result in the continued deterioration of the facilities, adversely affecting the reputation of the Council and leading to potential health and safety liability if accidents result from the condition of equipment. Both facilities could be removed permanently; however, this would still incur a cost and would result in the loss of facility to residents which would be at odds with the council's aims/objectives as stated above.			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L			
Start Date: Consultation commence April 2016		Completion Date: March 2017	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1:15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
£50,000		£50,000	
Capital Cost (Breakdown) £:			
Works £44,000	Equipment	Other	Fees £6,000
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16 £0	Year 2: 16/17 £0	
Year 3: 17/18 £0	Year 4: 18/19 £0	Year 5: 19/20 £0	
Proposed Funding			
External:		Internal: Regeneration and Community Projects Reserve (Special Expense)	
Useful Economic Life (years): 15		New/Replacement: Replacement	
Depreciation per annum: £3,330		Capital Financing Costs: £380 p.a.	
Residual Value: Nil		Category of Asset: Infrastructure	

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM 2015/16

Project Name: Alford Road Fencing (Special Expense)	Cost Centre: 0663	Ref: 9
<p>Detailed Description: To undertake a cost benefit assessment of two options of improving site security and safety at Alford Road recreation ground.</p> <p>Option 1 is to install a soil 'bund' around the perimeter of the site which would create a deterrent to young people running out onto the road chasing footballs. This would also make access by traveller caravans much more difficult.</p> <p>Option 2 would involve installation of recycled plastic boundary fence (high level knee rail style with intermediate rails to prevent balls passing through) approximately 800mm above ground level. This style and material would be very durable and wouldn't require any on-going maintenance (other than countering abuse).</p> <p>Both options would require the installation of a new height restrictor barrier with secure encased padlock to enable maintenance vehicles to access the site but prevent access by other unauthorised vehicles.</p>		
Location: Alford Road, Edwalton	Executive Manager: Communities	
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives:</p> <p>Corporate Theme: Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life.</p> <p>Strategic Task: a) Facilitate activities for Children and Young People to enable them to reach their potential.</p> <p>b) Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities</p>		
<p>Community Outcomes: The new boundary bund/fence would reduce the risk of a road traffic accident that is present due to the relatively close proximity of the sports pitches to a road. It will reduce the number of footballs going on to the road and provide a barrier which will make it less likely that a child would run out to retrieve a ball without thinking about passing traffic.</p> <p>The Alford Road recreation ground is the RBC site most vulnerable to unauthorised use by travellers. Installing a perimeter bund/fence will act as a deterrent to this type of misuse, which minimises disruption to local residents and the legal and clean-up costs incurred by the Council following a travellers visit.</p>		
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why:</p> <p>1. Do nothing – Although there has been no road traffic accidents reported to RBC as a result of football use of this site, users of the site have requested that a fence is installed to improve safety (particularly young people). If no action is taken then there remains a possibility that a serious road traffic accident could occur, with subsequent potential liability.</p> <p>There was an unauthorised traveller encampment in August 2014. There has been an increased level of traveller movement within the Rushcliffe Area through the year. The site is currently completely open and vehicles can simply drive over a drop kerb to access the site. Improved security measures have been implemented at other RBC open space sites, which means that without improving security at Alford Road it could become the default site for future traveller visits.</p> <p>Doing nothing has been discounted as the improvement works would be recovered through savings in legal fees and clean-up costs if future traveller visits are avoided over future years (depending on the length of stay and clear-up requirements one</p>		

visit by travellers can result in around £6,000-£8,000 of costs and lost income).

2. Install 2 metre high perimeter fence which could prevent a greater number of footballs from going on to the road. This has been discounted as it would make the site feel very enclosed and reduce its attractiveness as a public open space and recreational area for dog walkers and other general use. This option would also be more costly to install.

Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L

Start Date: May 2015

Completion Date: May 2015

Capital Cost (Total) :

Year 1:15/16

Year 2: 16/17

Up to £50,000

Up to £50,000

Capital Cost (Breakdown) £:

Works £44,000

Equipment £

Other

Fees £6,000

Revenue cost per annum:

Year 1: 15/16 £0

Year 2: 16/17 £0

Year 3: 17/18 £0

Year 4: 18/19 £0

Year 5: 19/20 £0

Proposed Funding

External:

Internal: Regeneration and Community Projects Reserve (Special Expenses)

Useful Economic Life (years):15

New/Replacement: New

Depreciation per annum: £3,330

Capital Financing Costs: £380 p.a.

Residual Value: Nil

Category of Asset: to be determined

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Information Systems Strategy		Cost Centre: 0596	Ref: 10
Detailed Description: On 16 October 2012, Cabinet adopted a new ICT Strategy to run from 2012-2016. The new strategy embraces the wider ICT partnership established in July 2011 between Rushcliffe Borough Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council. A Technical Delivery Plan has been produced to support the ICT Strategy.			
Location: Civic Centre		Executive Manager: Corporate Governance	
Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Strategic Task: Develop the use of technology to improve customer access and reduce costs.			
Community Outcomes: Residents are able to readily access Council services and information from any location and at a time by using a method that suits them. The ICT Strategy is closely aligned to the Council's "Four Year Plan" reviews and ICT will be instrumental in delivering the outcomes identified during these reviews. The Strategy will deliver: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the implementation of tools to improve integration between front and back office systems • IT solutions offering a wider choice of access channels that support improved standards of service for customers i.e. customer self-serve portals at RCCC • an improved ICT infrastructure that will deliver cost savings and reductions in energy usage • improved information and support for Members through electronic channels • efficiency savings, alignment of policies and technologies and a more resilient service through working in partnership with other authorities • an agile approach in order to be responsive to emerging technologies • a secure environment for customers data 			
Other Options Rejected and Why: Every project is the subject of a business case to be presented to, and approved by, the corporate ICT Projects Commissioning Group (EMT) in order to ensure that the most appropriate IT solution is chosen, having due regard to the alignment of technologies across the partnership and value for money. The option of not doing so would lead to out dated or incompatible technology which would result in lower performance, higher maintenance costs and hinder the drive for greater efficiencies.			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M			
Start Date: On-going		Completion Date: On-going	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
£446,000 (2 years)	£369,000	£77,000	
Capital Cost (Breakdown):			
Works	Equipment	Other	Fees
		£409,000	£37,000
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
	£81,500	£70,000	
Year 3: 17/18	Year 4: 18/19	Year 5: 19/20	
£70,000	£70,000	£70,000	

Proposed Funding	
External: N/A	Internal: Capital Receipts

Useful Economic Life (years): 3 years	New/Replacement: New and Replacement
Depreciation per annum: To be determined	Capital Financing Costs: £3,800
Residual Value: Nil	Category of Asset: to be determined

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: BLC Floodlights		Cost Centre: 0397	Ref: 11
<p>Detailed Description: Replace the floodlight systems to the lower artificial turf pitch (ATP) and to the athletics track. Both systems were installed in the early 1990's and have reached the end of their useful life, repairs are very costly and in many instances cannot be undertaken as parts are now obsolete. New floodlighting systems are more energy efficient with longer bulb life, lowering running costs for maintenance and energy used. The floodlight system on the track needs to be redesigned to better light the track and field event areas at the two ends of the track where activity takes place rather than the area in the centre of the track.</p>			
Location: Bingham Leisure Centre		Executive Manager: Finance and Commercial	
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life and • Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient, high quality services. 			
<p>Community Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate activities for children and young people to enable them to reach their potential; • Young people living in the Borough are healthy, active, confident and engaged in the communities in which they live: <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The main users of the track and ATP are clubs whose base is largely young people. The athletics club has seen a significant increase in membership since the Olympics in 2012 and the ATP is used by a number of clubs for junior training and matches.</p>			
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why: For the last 5 years repairs to both systems have been required on a regular basis. These have often been unsatisfactory because the component parts are not available or cannot be installed alongside other parts. The option of renewing elements of the system has been explored but, when compared to the costs of full scale replacement does not offer value for money.</p>			
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): L			
Start Date: April 2015		Completion Date: May 2015	
Capital Cost (Total) :	Year 1:15/16	Year 2: 16/17	
	£50,000		
Capital Cost (Breakdown) £: to be determined			
Works	Equipment	Other	Fees
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16 No extra cost		Year 2: 16/17
Year 3: 17/18	Year 4: 18/19		Year 5: 19/20

Proposed Funding	
External:	Internal: Joint Use Leisure Centres' Maintenance Reserve
Useful Economic Life (years): 15	New/Replacement: Replacement
Depreciation per annum: £3,330	Capital Financing Costs: £380 p.a.
Residual Value: Nil	Category of Asset: Equipment

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Arena Development	Cost Centre: 0415	Ref: 12		
<p>Detailed Description: This ambitious project will consolidate existing leisure facilities within West Bridgford on the Rushcliffe Arena Site. The project will also include extensive works to support the re-location of the Civic Centre to the Arena site. The development will encompass contemporary, flexible office accommodation, alongside the enhanced leisure facilities, meeting modern standards with regard to space and energy consumption. Key elements of the new leisure facility comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A six lane 25 metre pool, with separate learner pool • Sports Hall • A six lane indoor bowling arena • A gym capable of providing at least 150 stations • Dedicated dance and studio spaces • Café and leisure space <p>The project may also involve contributions to Rushcliffe School to enable elements of Rushcliffe Leisure Centre to be remodelled to support continued community use.</p>				
Location: The Arena Site, West Bridgford	Executive Manager: Finance and Commercial			
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Theme: Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life. Corporate Theme: Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high quality services. Strategic Task: Activate the Leisure Strategy to best provide leisure facilities and activities as the conditions prescribed in the Strategy arise. Strategic Task: Facilitate activities for Children and Young People to enable them to reach their potential. Strategic Task: Examine the future viability of all Council owned property to maximise the potential of the Council's property portfolio. Strategic Task: Deliver the Council's Four Year Plan to reduce costs, generate income and adopt more effective delivery models.</p>				
<p>Community Outcomes: Rushcliffe residents continue to be able to access a wide range of leisure facilities and activities helping them to maintain healthy and active lifestyles. Young people living in the Borough are healthy, active, confident, and engaged in the communities they live in. Property owned by the Council is utilised to its full potential or used to generate income for the Council enabling it to keep Council Tax as low as possible. Savings arising from the new leisure facility, new Civic offices and the alternate use or disposal of the Civic Centre will provide a major contribution towards the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.</p>				
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why: Relocation of leisure facilities to the Arena site is in line with the council's current Leisure Strategy which has considered a range of alternate delivery options. With regard to its office requirements: the Council could, should it wish, choose to stay at the current Civic Centre and undertake a refurbishment programme to enable it to further reduce the space taken up by its services.</p>				
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L): M				
Start Date: 2014/15 January 2015		Completion Date: December 2016		
Capital Cost (Total) :	Prior Year	Year 1: 15/16	Capital Cost (Total) :	Prior Year
£15,480,000	£2,020,000	£6,405,000	£15,480,000	£2,020,000

Capital Cost (Breakdown) £: To be determined			
Works	Equipment	Other	Works
Revenue cost per annum:	Year 1: 15/16 £0		Year 2: 16/17 £0
Year 3: 17/18 £0	Year 4: 18/19 £0		Year 5: 19/20 £0
Proposed Funding			
External: £1million New Homes Bonus		Internal: £5.14million from Reserves (including £1million from New Homes Bonus). The balance of £10.34million from internal borrowing	
Useful Economic Life (years): 40		New/Replacement: New and replacement	
Depreciation per annum: £355,000		Capital Financing Costs: £107,920	
Residual Value: Nil		Category of Asset: Operational Land and Buildings	

PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

Project Name: Investment Strategy	Cost Centre:	Ref: 13
<p>Detailed Description: As with other local authorities Rushcliffe faces the challenge of meeting on-going service demands at a time of reducing resources. The investment strategy presents a mechanism through which the Council can develop a balanced portfolio of investments that provide additional income to the Authority whilst also providing opportunities for wider positive economic and social impacts across the Borough. Due to the nature of these opportunities funding has not been requested for specific years but has instead been allocated in total enabling it to be drawn down as and when schemes are identified and approved. In order to ensure that such schemes do not impact on the availability of capital for core activities it is proposed that funding for investments would be drawn from external (i.e. Public Works Loan Board) borrowing and hence any returns will need to exceed the resultant repayment costs. Consideration will also need to be given to the governance mechanisms for the approval and monitoring of such investments and these requirements will be addressed following the agreement of this business case.</p>		
Location: Borough Wide	Executive Manager (Finance and Commercial)	
<p>Contribution to the Council's aims and objectives: Corporate Themes: Supporting economic growth to ensure a sustainable, prosperous and thriving local economy.</p>		
<p>Community Outcomes: To be assessed and determined for each individual investment opportunity.</p>		
<p>Other Options Rejected and Why: The Council could chose to not allocate funding to the acquisition and development of commercial and social assets resulting in lost opportunities for the delivery of additional income and associated social / economic benefits to the Borough. Alternately the Council could maintain a reactive stance which may enable some opportunities to be addressed but these would sit outside a long term planning framework.</p>		
Risk Rating High (H)/Medium (M)/ Low (L):		
Start Date: 1/4/15		Completion Date: 31/3/20
Capital Cost (Total) :	£10,000,000	Any asset acquisitions will give rise to asset values
Revenue Cost per annum:	To be determined and will involve the need to make a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) for any loan repayments together with associated interest charges. As stated above, any returns on the investments will need to exceed the resultant repayment costs.	
Proposed Funding		
External: £10,000,000 (Borrowing)		Internal: Nil