

AGENDA

Meeting: CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE
Place: Council Chamber - Council Offices, Browfort, Devizes
Date: Tuesday 19 April 2011
Time: 10.45 am or on the rising of Cabinet, whichever is the later

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Chris Marsh, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line (01225) 713058 or email chris.marsh@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Membership:

Cllr John Noeken
Cllr Fleur de Rhe-Philippe
Cllr Jane Scott OBE (Chair)

Cllr Toby Sturgis
Cllr John Thomson

AGENDA

Part I

Items to be considered when the meeting is open to the public.

1. **Apologies**

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting** *(Pages 1 - 8)*

To confirm and sign as a correct record the minutes of the Cabinet Capital Assets Committee meeting held on 7 February 2011 (copy herewith).

3. **Chairman's Announcements**

4. **Declarations of interest**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interests or dispensations granted by the Standards Committee.

5. **Capital Budget Monitoring 2010-11** *(Pages 9 - 20)*

Report of the Chief Finance Officer, to include the Highways Capital Funding Report.

6. **Proposed Revisions to Capital Programme** *(Pages 21 - 28)*

Report of the Service Director, Children's Commissioning and Performance.

7. **Workplace Transformation Programme Update**

To receive a verbal update from the Interim Programme Director - ICT, IM and The Campus and Operational Delivery Programme, regarding Workplace Transformation progress and activity, including disposals.

8. **Replacement of Simdell Housing Management IT System** *(Pages 29 - 46)*

Report of the Service Director, Housing.

9. **24, 26 and 28 Endless Street Salisbury - Business Case for Use by Wiltshire Coroner** *(Pages 47 - 58)*

Report of the Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services.

10. **Old Manor Hospital Site, Salisbury** *(To follow)*

Report of the Corporate Director, Community Services.

11. **Hungerdown Lane Site, Chippenham** *(To follow)*

Report of the Corporate Director, Community Services.

12. **Urgent items**

Any other items of business that the Chair agrees to consider as a matter of urgency.

13. **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

To consider passing the following resolution:

To agree that in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public from the meeting for the business specified in Items Number 14-16 because it is likely that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information to the public.

Part II

Items during whose consideration it is recommended that the public should be excluded because of the likelihood that exempt information would be disclosed.

14. **Proposed disposal of Council owned land at Bowerhill, Melksham** *(Pages 59 - 68)*

Report of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood and Planning.

15. **Contract Award for the County Hall Remodelling Construction Works** *(Pages 69 - 76)*

Report of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood and Planning.

16. **Purchase of the Former Tisbury Nadder Middle School Site from Thistledown Trust (Plymouth Brethren)** *(Pages 77 - 80)*

Report of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood and Planning.

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON 7 FEBRUARY 2011 AT COMMITTEE ROOM III - COUNTY HALL,
TROWBRIDGE.**

Present:

Cllr John Noeken, Cllr Fleur de Rhe-Philippe, Cllr Jane Scott OBE (Chair), Cllr Toby Sturgis
and Cllr John Thomson

Also Present:

Cllr Tony Deane and Cllr Jeff Osborn

1. **Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held 10 January 2011 were presented and it was,

Resolved:

To approve and sign the minutes as a correct record.

3. **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no Chairman's announcements.

4. **Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

5. **Capital Budget Monitoring Report**

The Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Risk introduced the item and outlined the scope of the report and purpose of the proposals contained therein.

The Committee then received a brief presentation from the Interim Head of Financial Planning, setting out the contents of the report and making recommendations as per the report.

The Interim Head of Financial Planning also clarified that the figure of £1.462m in point c) of the recommendations had been approved by the secretary of state and was now confirmed.

Following discussion regarding the points raised and recommendations made in the officer's report, it was,

Resolved:

To approve the recommendations of the Interim Head of Financial Planning, as follows:

- a) **To note the current position of the 2010-11 capital programme.**
- b) **Note the budget changes in section 1 of Appendix B.**
- c) **To recommend to council the addition of £1.462m in the 2010-11 Capital Programme for capitalisation of redundancy costs as approved by the secretary of state.**
- d) **To note the budget virements detailed in paragraphs 8 to 10 of the report.**
- e) **To note the requirements of reintroducing the £1.025m Hubs Strategy contribution back into the Workplace Transformation Project for the 2011-12 Capital Programme.**

5a. **Capital Programme Proposals**

The Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Risk introduced the item and outlined the scope of the report and purpose of the proposals contained therein.

The Committee then received a presentation from the Interim Head of Financial Planning, setting out the contents of the report and making recommendations as per the report.

Key points were as follows:

- Report addresses the outstanding capital spending from the paper presented to the Cabinet Capital Assets Committee on 10 January 2011
- Key areas of capital investment are on highways, education, waste, workplace transformation, broadband and the libraries RFID request considered later in the meeting
- Proposals fit within the context of the 'no further changes' policy as set out and approved in the previous meeting of the Cabinet Committee
- That the proposals, if approved, were scheduled to be considered by Scrutiny on 10 February and recommended to Cabinet on 15 February.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Communities and Libraries sought clarification on the figures contained in paragraph 11 of the report, and it was confirmed that the £0.505m value related to annual budget savings, and was contextualised within that section of the report.

The Committee received a question from Cllr Tony Deane, Vice-Chair of the Budget & Performance Task Group, in relation to whether Wiltshire Council had a dedicated in-house team responsible for the renegotiation of contracts and lobbying central government to repeal legislation impeding their capacity to do so. It was confirmed that no such distinct team existed, but that all service areas were expected to identify any legislative limitations on their ability to deliver best value for their particular service needs this way. The Corporate Leadership Team would also be lobbying ministers directly to this effect.

Following discussion regarding the points raised and recommendations made in the officer's report, it was,

Resolved:

To approve the recommendations of the Interim Head of Financial Planning, as follows:

That the Cabinet Capital Assets Committee make the following recommendations to Cabinet on 15 February 2011 which will be presented to Scrutiny on 10 February 2011:

- a) **To approve the Wiltshire Council Capital Programme for 2011-12 to 2014-15 as shown in Appendix A of the report.**

6. Local Transport Plan and Highway Funding

The Service Director, Strategic Services, introduced the item and outlined the scope of the report and general aims of the proposals contained therein.

The Committee then received a presentation setting out the contents of the report and making recommendations as per the report.

Key points raised were as follows:

- Reasons for increased cost of highways maintenance, including addressing specific highways issues and a backlog of work in general
- Guarantee of Local Transport Plan grant funding for 2011-12, as announced by the Department for Transport in December 2010, where previously this had been provided through supported borrowing
- No guarantee that additional central government funding would be provided to address Winter weather damage to highways, therefore this would have to be accommodated within Council capital budget as requested
- The allocation of funding set out in the report related solely to highway maintenance and not to highway improvements
- Consultation at local level has placed highways as a key issue for local people and one to which feedback has suggested more resource should be allocated

The Leader of the Council sought clarification that the proposals contained in the Service Director's report correlated with the values set out in the report of the Interim Head of Financial Planning at agenda item 5a. It was confirmed that this was the case, and that these plans were encapsulated within the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

Following discussion regarding the points raised and recommendations made in the officer's report, it was,

Resolved:

To approve the recommendations of the Service Director, Strategic Services, as follows:

That the capital programme for 2011/12 should include:

- (i) £250,000 for footway reconstruction and surfacing.**
- (ii) £500,000 for additional carriageway surface dressing.**

7. **Workplace Transformation Programme - Depot Facilities Strategy and Implementation Plan**

The Cabinet Member for Resources introduced the item and outlined the scope of the report and general aims of the proposals contained therein.

The Committee then received a presentation setting out the contents of the report and making recommendations as per the report.

Key points raised were as follows:

- Current stock of 12 main Council depots poses significant issues around suitability and physical condition
- Proliferation of depots is due to the number of duplicate facilities inherited from the four district councils and former County Council
- Depot strategy aims to address facilities stock issues whilst serving as an exercise in future cost avoidance
- Anticipated future costs include maintenance and improvement, running costs and carbon emissions costs
- Limited scope for redistribution or expansion of the 25 services currently housed in existing depots
- Prospect of an interim merger of the depots at Wilton and Churchfields in Salisbury in order to begin site disposal
- Request for capital investment in the depot strategy in order to realise revenue savings over the next 25 years has previously been agreed by the Committee as part of the capital programme, therefore Committee is asked to endorse the strategy and implementation plan

The Committee received a question from Cllr Jeff Osborn, Chair of the Organisation and Resources Select Committee in relation to the extent of bureaucracy inherent in the sourcing of three new suitable sites and the resource implications of this. It was acknowledged that this was an issue, but confirmed that this would be considered in the assessment of prospective new sites.

Cllr Toby Sturgis, Cabinet Member for Waste, Property and Environment, raised a concern regarding a Department for Communities and Local Government request for an exhaustive list of council-owned properties from Wiltshire Council, and the misleading appearance of this raw data in the current state of flux. It was confirmed that any information provided would be accompanied by an explanatory note, but agreed that the prospect of asset values being used to estimate Council reserves at this time would pose a risk.

The Leader raised a query regarding the cost of an interim merger of the facilities at Wilton and Churchfields, including the bureaucratic demands of this. It was confirmed, however, that this would still be the preferred and most cost efficient option due to the marketability implications of the Wilton depot site upon its future disposal and the benefits of early co-location to the performance of the service.

Following discussion regarding the points raised and recommendations made in the officer's report, it was,

Resolved:

To approve the recommendations of the Corporate Director, Neighbourhood and Planning, as follows:

That the Cabinet Capital Assets Committee endorse the depot facilities strategy and outline implementation plan as part of the Workplace Transformation Programme subject to funding approval via the capital programme.

8. Libraries Service Review - RFID Capital Investment Proposal

The Cabinet Member, Adult Care, Communities and Libraries, introduced the item and outlined the scope of the report and general aims of the proposals contained therein.

The Committee then received a presentation setting out the contents of the report, drawing attention to the business case at Appendix I, and making recommendations as per the report.

Key points raised were as follows:

- Requested capital investment serves as part of the Libraries Service Review, to be approved in full by Cabinet
- Anticipated that the £546,450 of capital investment requested would realise £505,000 year-on-year in revenue savings
- Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology proposed would enable a greater level of self-service at Wiltshire's public libraries
- Overall positive response to proposed strategy received at local level
- Increased community control facilitated through the strategy falls in line with the wider Big Society agenda
- Strategy of utilising voluntary staff from the community as well as RFID technology is backed by advice at central government level

The Committee received a comment from Cllr Jeff Osborn, Chair of the Organisation and Resources Select Committee, to the effect that Scrutiny had been consulted throughout the process and were satisfied with the strategy adopted as a means of ensuring future service delivery.

Following discussion regarding the points raised and recommendations made in the officer's report, it was,

Resolved:

To approve the recommendations of the Director of Community Services as follows:

To approve the bid for capital investment in R.F.I.D technology, subject to the Council's capital programme setting process. The council would then be in a position to provide:

- **21 council operated libraries**

- **5 mobile libraries including a special service mobile**
- **10 libraries operated in partnership with local communities – providing opportunities for volunteers**
- **Opportunities for volunteers to extend the opening hours available at many local libraries, and for the library service to make best use of staff to keep libraries open for core/streamlined hours**

9. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 2.30 - 3.10 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Chris Marsh, of Democratic & Members' Services, direct line (01225) 713058, e-mail chris.marsh@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

This page is intentionally left blank

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

19 April 2011

Subject: Capital Budget Monitoring 2010-11

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Fleur de Rhe-Philippe, Finance,
Performance and Risk**

Key Decision: No

Executive Summary

The report reflects the position of the 2010-11 capital programme as at 28 February 2011.

The report also details budget changes which are to be noted by Cabinet.

Proposal

- a) To note the current position of the 2010-11 capital programme.
- b) Note the budget changes in section 1 of Appendix B.
- c) Note the additional reprogramming of budgets in section 2 of Appendix B.
- d) Note the detailed allocation of Highways spending in 2011/12.

Reasons for Proposals

To inform cabinet of the current position of the 2010-11 capital programme.

Michael Hudson

Interim Chief Finance Officer

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

19 April 2011

Subject: Capital Budget Monitoring 2010-11

Cabinet Member: Councillor Fleur de Rhe-Philippe
Finance, Performance and Risk

Key Decision: No

Purpose of Report

1. To update Cabinet Capital Assets Committee on the position of the Capital Programme as at 28 February 2011.

Background

2. Since the last meeting the budget has been adjusted as follows;

	£m	Notes
2010-11 Capital budget (as per CCAC 7 February 2011)	167.314	
Budget adjustments awaiting Cabinet approval since February's meeting (CFO Delegations)	2.399	Net budget adjustments as detailed in Appendix B of this report.
Re-profiling of budgets from 2010/11 to 2011/12 as identified as part of 2011/12 Capital Programme budget setting report	(43.014)	Reprogramming approved as part of 2011/12 budget report.
Re-profiling of budgets from 2010/11 to 2011/12 identified as part of this report	(7.366)	Reprogramming as detailed in Appendix B of this report.
Capitalisation of Redundancy costs under directive from Secretary of State	1.462	As approved in February 2011 report.
Reduction of Devolved Formula Capital	(0.299)	Reduction in budget to match 2010/11 grant allocation.
Revised Capital budget 2010-11	120.496	

Summary of Current Position

3. The major re-profiling of schemes undertaken as part of the budget setting for the next four years capital programme and during the normal budget monitoring since the last report has identified just over £50 million to be re-profiled into later years. This has now been fully reflected in the revised capital budget.

4. The financial position of the 2010-11 capital programme is summarised below.

Department	Revised 2010-11 Budget £m	Actual Spend as at 28 Feb 2011 £m	Forecast Outturn £m	Full Year Projected Variance* £m
Children & Education	51.733	37.667	51.733	0.000
Resources	24.733	18.132	24.733	0.000
Neighbourhood & Planning	41.704	32.413	41.694	(0.010)
Community Services	2.326	0.319	2.326	0.000
Total	120.496	88.531	120.486	(0.010)

* Underspends are shown in brackets

5. A breakdown of the position for individual schemes within the capital programme can be seen in appendix A.
6. The variance on the full year projection is £0.010 underspend. This is after the reprogramming of schemes from 2010/11 to 2011/12.
7. There is a minor underspend of £0.032m forecast on the Waste Management budget line as a result of the Monument Hill Reed Bed scheme costing less than originally anticipated.
8. The Tidworth Castledown budget line is reporting a forecast underspend of £0.166m with the scheme costing less than originally anticipated.
9. The Road Maintenance budget line is currently forecasting costs of £0.187m in excess of its budget. Budget Managers expect to cover the higher than anticipated costs with virements from other highways budgets to ensure no overspend is realised at year end. The virement will be actioned in future reports.

Highways Capital Funding Allocation 2011/12

10. The Council approved in the Capital Programme for 2011/12 £18.952 million for Highways schemes, which would be funded from various resources, mainly LTP Government grant funding.
11. Work has been undertaken to analyse this area of spending further to give greater clarity. The table below shows the proposal for the budget to be allocated against the areas of expenditure.

Highways Allocation	£ million
Integrated Transport	2.501
Structures	3.500
Major maintenance	1.750
Minor improvements	0.350
Road surfacing	9.310
Road drainage	0.700
Footways	0.250
Other assets, lighting etc	0.350
Land compensation	0.241
Total Highways Spending 2011/12	18.952

12. In addition to the above the Government has announced additional funding to help deal with Winter Maintenance. The amount allocated at a national level was recently doubled at the budget announcement and the level of award to Wiltshire for 2011/12 will be £3.7 million. The details of the schemes to be carried out will be posted on the Councils website.

Main Considerations for the Council

- a) To note the current financial position of the 2010-11 Capital Budget.
- b) To note the budget changes in section 1 of Appendix B.
- c) To note the additional reprogramming of budgets in section 2 of Appendix B
- d) To note the detailed allocation of Highways Spending in 2011/12

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

13. Wiltshire Council is preparing for its mandatory inclusion to the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC). The CRC is the UK's mandatory climate change and energy saving scheme, due to commence in April 2010. The objectives of the scheme are to improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon dioxide emissions. It's calculated that 79% of the Council's carbon footprint comes from energy use in buildings. Capital schemes therefore have the potential to greatly increase or decrease carbon emissions, for example schemes making council buildings more energy efficient will reduce the Council's carbon footprint.

Equality and Diversity Impact of the Proposal

14. No equality and diversity issues have been identified arising from this report

Risk Assessment

15. The capital budget for 2010-11 has a number of potential risks arising from cost overruns or lower than expected levels of capital receipts. Such issues will be highlighted as soon as they establish themselves through the monthly reporting process. Members may wish to bear in mind that the capital programme has been set for three years and therefore risks will be appraised over the whole period (2010-11 through to 2012-13).

Financial Implications

16. These have been examined and are contained within the report.

Legal Implications

17. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Michael Hudson
Interim Chief Finance Officer

Report Author: Lloyd Brown

Unpublished documents relied upon in the preparation of this report: NONE
Environmental impact of the recommendations contained in this report: NONE

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A

CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING STATEMENT AS AT PERIOD 11 (28 FEBRUARY 2011)

SCHEME NAME	DEPT	2010/11 BUDGET	SLIPPAGE IDENTIFIED in 2011-12 BUDGET SETTING REPORT	REPROFILING OF SCHEMES AS PER APPENDIX B	REVISED 2010/11 BUDGET	EXPENDITURE TO PERIOD 11	FORECAST OUTTURN SPEND	PROJECTED VARIANCE
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Wellington Academy	DCE	13.907	0.000	5.973	19.880	14.832	19.880	0.000
Salisbury Academy	DCE	1.290	(0.112)	(0.478)	0.700	0.610	0.700	0.000
Extended Schools	DCE	1.342	0.000	0.000	1.342	0.791	1.342	0.000
Additional Accommodation	DCE	8.835	(5.204)	(1.646)	1.985	0.766	1.985	0.000
Access and Inclusion	DCE	1.405	(0.523)	0.311	1.193	0.619	1.193	0.000
NDS Maintenance	DCE	3.979	(0.111)	0.111	3.979	2.550	3.979	0.000
NDS Modernisation	DCE	0.817	0.000	(0.207)	0.610	0.385	0.610	0.000
Devolved formula Capital	DCE	4.083	(0.287)	0.287	4.083	4.111	4.083	0.000
DCSF Primary Capital programme	DCE	10.081	(3.199)	(2.928)	3.954	2.473	3.954	0.000
Melksham Oak School	DCE	4.375	0.000	0.000	4.375	3.727	4.375	0.000
DCSF Targeted Capital 14-19 SEN	DCE	7.640	(4.815)	(1.750)	1.075	0.774	1.075	0.000
Targeted Capital Food Technology General	DCE	0.803	0.000	0.000	0.803	0.451	0.803	0.000
Targeted Capital School Kitchens General	DCE	0.929	0.000	0.000	0.929	0.929	0.929	0.000
Other Projects New Schools	DCE	3.571	(1.966)	(1.200)	0.405	0.290	0.405	0.000
Other Schools Projects - Expansions	DCE	2.741	(0.949)	(1.173)	0.619	0.103	0.619	0.000
Other Schools Projects - Replacements	DCE	0.564	(0.430)	0.087	0.221	0.170	0.221	0.000
DCSF 14-19 Diplomas reforms	DCE	0.696	0.000	0.000	0.696	0.620	0.696	0.000
DCSF Information System Parents & Providers	DCE	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	(0.010)	0.000	0.000
Sure Start early years	DCE	4.163	0.000	0.000	4.163	3.290	4.163	0.000
LPSA PRG (DCE)	DCE	0.104	0.000	0.000	0.104	0.000	0.104	0.000
Aiming High for Disabled Children	DCE	0.478	0.000	0.000	0.478	0.099	0.478	0.000
Youth Projects	DCE	0.138	0.000	0.000	0.138	0.088	0.138	0.000
DCE TOTAL		71.942	(17.596)	(2.613)	51.733	37.667	51.733	0.000
BMP/SAP	DOR	0.455	0.000	0.000	0.455	0.000	0.455	0.000
LPSA PRG (Resources)	DOR	0.043	0.000	0.000	0.043	0.000	0.043	0.000
Area Boards	DOR	0.615	0.000	0.000	0.615	0.311	0.615	0.000
Revenue & Benefits Systems.	DOR	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.244	0.250	0.000
Campus, Operational and Delivery	DOR	39.547	(20.265)	0.000	19.282	16.268	19.282	0.000
Buildings repair & Maintenance	DOR	2.577	0.000	0.000	2.577	1.281	2.577	0.000
The Shambles	DOR	0.380	0.000	(0.370)	0.010	0.003	0.010	0.000
County Farms	DOR	0.050	0.000	(0.046)	0.004	0.000	0.004	0.000
Redundancy Capitalisation Directive	DOR	1.462	0.000	0.000	1.462	0.000	1.462	0.000
Other DOR Initiatives	DOR	0.034	0.000	0.000	0.034	0.025	0.034	0.000
DOR TOTAL		45.413	(20.265)	(0.415)	24.733	18.132	24.733	0.000

APPENDIX A

CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING STATEMENT AS AT PERIOD 11 (28 FEBRUARY 2011)

SCHEME NAME	DEPT	2010/11 BUDGET	SLIPPAGE IDENTIFIED IN 2011-12 BUDGET SETTING REPORT	REPROFILING OF SCHEMES AS PER APPENDIX B	REVISED 2010/11 BUDGET	EXPENDITURE TO PERIOD 11	FORECAST OUTTURN SPEND	PROJECTED VARIANCE
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
LTP – Integrated Transport	DNP	4.490	(0.500)	0.500	4.490	2.867	4.490	0.000
LTP – Maintenance of Principal/Non Principal roads Inc Bridges	DNP	13.328	0.000	0.000	13.328	11.857	13.328	0.000
Additional Highway Maintenance	DNP	2.639	0.000	0.000	2.639	0.799	2.639	0.000
Footways	DNP	0.249	0.000	0.000	0.249	0.000	0.249	0.000
Land Drainage	DNP	0.473	0.000	0.000	0.473	0.402	0.473	0.000
Major Integrated Tr. Improvements	DNP	0.034	0.000	0.000	0.034	0.032	0.034	0.000
Major Highway Improvements	DNP	0.541	(0.241)	(0.013)	0.287	0.114	0.287	0.000
Waste Vehicles	DNP	2.068	0.000	0.000	2.068	1.632	2.068	0.000
Leisure & Amenities	DNP	0.563	0.000	0.000	0.563	0.132	0.563	0.000
Waste Management	DNP	2.403	(0.198)	(0.047)	2.158	1.879	2.126	(0.032)
PSA PRG (TEL)	DNP	0.225	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.229	0.225	0.000
Road Maintenance Vehicles	DNP	0.092	0.000	0.000	0.092	0.223	0.279	0.187
Pest Control vehicles	DNP	0.015	0.000	0.000	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.000
Corporate Carbon Reduction	DNP	0.500	0.000	(0.100)	0.400	0.282	0.400	0.000
Consolidated IT System	DNP	0.650	0.000	(0.650)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Tidworth Castledown	DNP	0.181	0.000	0.000	0.181	0.017	0.015	(0.166)
Economic Development	DNP	1.971	0.000	(1.665)	0.306	0.292	0.306	0.000
Disabled facilities grants Housing	DNP	3.035	(0.235)	(0.300)	2.500	2.056	2.500	0.000
Corporate other housing grants	DNP	3.072	(1.591)	(0.391)	1.090	0.938	1.090	0.000
Strategic Housing	DNP	3.405	0.000	(0.843)	2.562	2.042	2.562	0.000
New Housing	DNP	7.301	(1.823)	(1.056)	4.422	3.363	4.422	0.000
HRA	DNP	3.790	0.000	(0.167)	3.623	3.242	3.623	0.000
	DNP TOTAL	51.024	(4.588)	(4.732)	41.704	32.413	41.694	(0.010)
Adult Social Care Strategy & Commissioning - Older People	DCS	1.340	(0.398)	0.398	1.339	0.005	1.339	0.000
Adult Social Care Strategy & Commissioning - Learning Disability	DCS	0.177	0.000	0.000	0.177	0.000	0.177	0.000
Adult Social Care Strategy & Commissioning - Mental Health	DCS	0.796	(0.167)	(0.003)	0.626	0.273	0.626	0.000
Resources Other	DCS	0.127	0.000	0.000	0.127	0.028	0.127	0.000
Safer, Stronger Communities Fund	DCS	0.057	0.000	0.000	0.057	0.014	0.057	0.000
	DCS TOTAL	2.497	(0.565)	0.395	2.326	0.319	2.326	0.000
TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010-2011		170.876	(43.014)	(7.366)	120.496	88.531	120.486	(0.010)

**CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER (CFO) - EXERCISE OF DELEGATED POWERS & REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES
WITHIN THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Cabinet Meeting
Financial Year:

19 April 2011

2010/11

SECTION 1 - DELEGATED CFO POWERS

*"Adjustment/addition of scheme in the capital programme which has no effect on the net funding position of the programme
i.e. Additional resources available in the form of Grant, Section 106 contributions etc,etc which fund the addition, "*

Project Name: Rutland Bungalows Supported Living
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
122,300		

Funding Source: Grant

Project Name: Targeted Capital Food Technology
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
57,115		

Funding Source: School Contribution

Project Name: Area Board Capital
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
93,000		

Funding Source: Grant & School Contribution

Project Name: Waste Management
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
55,051		

Funding Source: Revenue Contribution

Project Name: Additional Accommodation
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
753,200		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: Other Schools Projects - Expansions
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
534,929		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: Wellington Academy
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
80,057		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: Other Schools Projects - Replacements
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
220,528		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: DCSF Primary Capital programme
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
29,837		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: Melksham Oak School
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
23,233		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: NDS Modernisation
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
463		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions

Project Name: NDS Maintenance
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
411,629		

Funding Source: S106 Contributions & School Contributions

Project Name: Access & Inclusion
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
17,904		

Funding Source: School Contribution

2,399,248 Total Delegated Changes Approved by Section 151 Officer

**CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER (CFO) - EXERCISE OF DELEGATED POWERS & REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES
WITHIN THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Cabinet Meeting
Financial Year:

19 April 2011
2010/11

SECTION 2 - DELEGATED CFO POWERS

"Schemes within the capital programme which require the reprogramming of expenditure between years due to scheme not progressing as originally anticipated or other circumstances"

Project Name:	<u>Wellington Academy</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">5,973,000</td> <td align="right">-5,973,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	5,973,000	-5,973,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
5,973,000	-5,973,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Salisbury Academy</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-478,000</td> <td align="right">478,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-478,000	478,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-478,000	478,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Additional Accomodation</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-1,646,000</td> <td align="right">1,646,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-1,646,000	1,646,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-1,646,000	1,646,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Access and Inclusion</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">311,000</td> <td align="right">-311,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	311,000	-311,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
311,000	-311,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>New Deals for Schools Maintenance</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">111,000</td> <td align="right">-111,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	111,000	-111,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
111,000	-111,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>New Deals for Schools Modernisation</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-207,000</td> <td align="right">207,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-207,000	207,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-207,000	207,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Devolved Formula Capital</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">287,000</td> <td align="right">-287,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	287,000	-287,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
287,000	-287,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>DCSF Primary Capital Programme</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-2,928,000</td> <td align="right">2,982,800</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-2,928,000	2,982,800	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-2,928,000	2,982,800						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>DCSF Targeted Capital 14-19 SEN</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-1,750,000</td> <td align="right">1,750,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-1,750,000	1,750,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-1,750,000	1,750,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Other Projects New Schools</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-1,200,000</td> <td align="right">1,200,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-1,200,000	1,200,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-1,200,000	1,200,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Other School Projects - Expansions</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-1,173,000</td> <td align="right">1,173,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-1,173,000	1,173,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-1,173,000	1,173,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Other School Projects - Replacements</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">87,000</td> <td align="right">-87,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	87,000	-87,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
87,000	-87,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>The Shambles</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-370,000</td> <td align="right">370,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-370,000	370,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-370,000	370,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>County Farms</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-46,000</td> <td align="right">46,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-46,000	46,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-46,000	46,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>LTP - Integrated Transport</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">500,000</td> <td align="right">-500,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	500,000	-500,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
500,000	-500,000						
Funding Source:							
Description:	Reprofiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years						
Project Name:	<u>Major Highways Improvements</u>						
Budget Change:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="right">-13,000</td> <td align="right">13,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	-13,000	13,000	
2010/11	2011/12	2012/13					
-13,000	13,000						
Funding Source:							

**CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER (CFO) - EXERCISE OF DELEGATED POWERS & REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES
WITHIN THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Cabinet Meeting: 19 April 2011
Financial Year: 2010/11

Description: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Waste Management
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-47,000	47,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Corporate Carbon Reduction
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-100,000	100,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Consolidated IT System
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-650,000	650,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Economic Development
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-1,665,000	1,665,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Disabled facilities Grant
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-300,000	300,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Corporate Other Housing Grants
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-391,000	391,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Strategic Housing
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-843,000	843,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: New Housing
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-1,056,000	1,056,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: HRA
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-167,000	167,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Adult Social Care Strategy & Commissioning - Older People
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
398,000	-398,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

Project Name: Adult Social Care Strategy & Commissioning - Mental Health
Budget Change:

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
-3,000	3,000	

Funding Source: Re-profiling of Scheme to match anticipated expenditure between financial years

-7,366,000 Total Re-profiling during February 2011 included in April 2011 Report

SECTION 3 - REQUESTS TO CABINET FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

"Adjustment/addition of scheme to the capital programme which places an additional funding requirement on the programme"

Project Name:
Budget Change:

2009/10	2010/11	2011/12

Funding Source:
Description:

In the exercise of my delegated powers (Section 1 and 2), I hereby authorise the amendments to the Capital Programme summarised above.

CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER: Micheal Hudson

SIGNED:

DATE: April 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

19 April 2011

Subject: Proposed Revisions to Capital Programme

Cabinet Member: Councillor Fleur de Rhe-Philipe, Finance, Performance and Risks

Key Decision: No

Executive Summary

The report provides details of the Department for Education schools capital allocations to Wiltshire, the implications for the Council's Capital Programme and the intended use of the funds.

Proposals

- (a) that Members note the impact and intended purposes of 2011/12 DfE schools capital allocations
- (b) that a further report on future years is brought to Cabinet Capital Assets Committee once the outcome of the national capital review is known.

Reason for Proposal

Cabinet recently approved 2011/12 capital allocations for schools and this paper further informs Members about these allocations.

Stephanie Denovan
Service Director, Schools and Learning

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

19 April 2011

Subject: Proposed Revisions to Capital Programme

Cabinet Member: Councillor Fleur de Rhe-Philippe, Finance, Performance and Risks

Key Decision: No

1. Current Position

1.1 The Capital Programme for 2010/11 included the following allocations:

Additional Accommodation	4,029,000	Supported borrowing
Access and Inclusion	855,000	Supported borrowing
Primary Capital Programme	6,343,000	Grant
New Deal for Schools	4,446,000	Grant
	462,000	Supported Borrowing
Targeted Capital 14-19/SEN	6,000,000	Grant

2. DfE Announcement of Allocations to Wiltshire

2.1 In late December 2010 DfE announced the following allocations to Wiltshire for 2011/12:

Additional Accommodation	8,472,070	Grant
New Deal for Schools (NDS)	7,992,771	Grant
Primary Capital Programme	0	
Access and Inclusion	0	
Targeted Capital	0	

and indicated that these allocations are for:

- Additional Accommodation – basic need funding to provide school places where needed in all categories of taxpayer funded schools. All taxpayer funded schools include voluntary aided schools, open academies, and new Free Schools where they address basic need pressures.
- New Deal for Schools – for the capital maintenance of buildings and equipment in community, voluntary controlled and foundation schools, and children’s centres.

2.2 DfE also announced that allocations for 2012 until 2015 will be informed by the outcome of the national capital review, which will be published in early 2011.

3. Implications of DfE Allocations

3.1 The financial implications of the DfE confirmed allocations are beneficial to the Council as both categories are grant and so there will be no need to bear the costs of supported borrowing. Cabinet was advised of this at their meeting of 8th February and confirmed the Additional Accommodation and NDS allocations in the current capital programme.

3.2 The DfE allocations are based on data supplied to them by the Council in recent years and reflect the following:

Additional Accommodation – future pupil number forecasts which, in turn, are informed by current pupil numbers, health data on 0-4 year olds, and future housing forecasts. There will be significant increases in pupil numbers in many areas in the coming years, and some areas are already coming under pressure for pupil places.

New Deal for Schools – condition and suitability data drawn from school surveys which reflect that:

- there is a Buildings Maintenance backlog in Wiltshire schools of over £60 million, and
- there are over 300 ‘temporary’ classrooms in Wiltshire schools that will cost over £50 million to replace with permanent buildings. Some of these buildings are over 40 years old.

The DfE allocations are, therefore, the DfE’s estimates of how much the Council should be spending to address these issues.

Access and Inclusion – 1.1 above identified that the DfE have discontinued a separate funding stream for this category. Previous allocations had been used to improve access to schools for disabled pupils through a twin track approach:

- (i) strategic - the development of at least one fully accessible primary school in each community area, and one fully accessible secondary

- school in each former district area to minimise the distance that pupils have to travel
- (ii) pupil specific - the provision of adaptations/equipment for individual pupils at their preferred schools

Investments in recent years will meet the strategic intention but there will be an ongoing need for provision for individual pupils and a contingency of £100,000 has been identified from existing budgets for such purposes. Further consideration to this issue will be given once the national capital review has been completed.

3.4 DfE have made no allocation for the Primary Capital Programme. This had been initiated as a 15 – 20 year programme for rebuilding/refurbishing existing primary schools and grant has been received and committed for the last two years. Our ability to maintain elements of this programme will be reviewed once the national capital review has been completed and future years DfE allocations confirmed. A further report on this will be brought to CCAC in due course.

3.5 The implications of not confirming these DfE allocations for their intended purpose in the Capital Programme would have been:

- Additional Accommodation – that the Council would, over the coming years, not have enough school places in some areas and be in breach of its statutory duty. Such a position would also be very damaging to community cohesion as an essential element of community infrastructure, i.e. local school places, would be missing.

There are immediate pupil number pressures in Malmesbury, East Trowbridge, the Corsham area, Downton and Shrewton. The DfE allocation and appropriate S106 funds will enable us to address these immediately.

Other priorities will be closely linked to future housing completions. The timings of these are not yet certain and so future priorities cannot currently be confirmed. Schemes such as Hampton Park (Salisbury) and Ridgeway Farm (W Swindon) are likely to need considerable investment from the Council. It is essential to have these funds available for immediate access once housing schemes start.

The issue of Free Schools is an emerging one nationally and whilst there are no known current plans for Free Schools in the County proposals may emerge at any time. Contingency provision therefore needs to be made from the current allocation.

- New Deal for Schools – the current context detailed in 3.2 above shows that there is an urgent need to invest in improving our school buildings so that pupils, staff and communities have improved facilities. Schools would view any reduction in expenditure as detrimental, especially as

Devolved Formula Capital to schools, which funds their own maintenance works, has been reduced by 60%-80%. The principles for prioritising investment of NDS have been agreed with headteacher representatives and the intended use is:

- £4.6 million will be spent on school maintenance issues. Priorities have been identified by DOR property maintenance team and schemes included are shown at Annex A
- £3.3 million will be spent on rebuilding “temporary” buildings. Reviews have prioritised the replacement of temporary buildings at Warminster Sambourne Church of England (VC) Primary School and St Johns C of E Primary, Warminster, and feasibility studies have been commissioned for these projects. Other projects are currently being identified.

4. Environmental Impact of the Proposal

4.1 All Additional Accommodation investment will be for new buildings that meet the Council’s sustainability agenda. NDS investment to improve (e.g. new boiler, new roof) or replace (old temporary buildings) will also improve the sustainability of schools buildings and have a positive environmental impact.

5. Equality and Diversity Impact of the Proposal

5.1 Currently many pupils are being educated in poor quality buildings and there is a clear link between the quality of school buildings, pupils and staff well being and performance. Improvements to the current building stock will therefore improve equality of provision.

The provision of additional school places will increase choice and diversity for Wiltshire parents.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 These have been detailed in the report in relation to the Council’s statutory obligation.

7. Risk Assessment

7.1 Ongoing review of future pupil numbers minimises the risk of not having enough school places. Condition related data is monitored to prioritise maintenance investment in schools with the greatest need.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 These have been examined and detailed above.

9. Proposals

(a) that Members note the impact and intended purposes of 2011/12 DfE schools capital allocations

(b) that a further report on future years is brought to Cabinet Capital Assets Committee once the outcome of the national capital review is known.

10. Reason for Proposal

Cabinet recently approved 2011/12 capital allocations for schools and this paper further informs Members about these allocations

Stephanie Denovan
Service Director, Schools and Learning

Report Author:

Nick Glass, Manager, School Buildings and Places

5 April 2011

Background Papers

None

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report:

None

Appendices

Appendix I: 2011 -12 Planned Maintenance Works to be Funded by New Deal for Schools

2011 -12 Planned Maintenance Works to be Funded by New Deal for Schools

School	Proposed Project	Estimated Cost £
Amesbury Junior	flat roof - hall	60,000
Amesbury Stonehenge	re-wire - upper block phase 2	220,000
Amesbury Stonehenge	boilers	120,000
B.o.A St Laurence	flat roof b2 phase2	110,000
B.o.A St Laurence	pitched roofs	150,000
Bratton Primary	pitched roof	180,000
Brinkworth Earl Danby (upper)	boiler	23,000
Britford Primary	flat roof b1	23,000
Calne John Bentley	heating phase 2	200,000
Calne Priestley C/B	re-wire	15,000
Calne Springfields	re-wire	250,000
Calne Springfields School	heating (heads house)	10,000
Calne St Dunstan	boiler	50,000
Chippenham St Nicholas	pitched roof	18,000
Chippenham St Nicholas	boiler	35,000
Chippenham St Pauls	boiler C/T	5,000
Churchfields The Village School Monkton Farleigh	boiler	50,000
Corsham Regis	boiler	35,000
Cricklade St Sampsons Junior	flat roof b2	8,500
Crudwell Primary	flat roof	9,500
Crudwell Primary	boiler	50,000
Devizes Downlands	flat roof b6	14,000
Devizes School	flat roof (Science block) phase 2	70,000
Five Lanes Potterne	re-wire	125,000
Holt Primary	re-wire	150,000
Hullavington	boiler renewal	30,000
Hullavington	flat roofs	50,000
Lacock	flat roof	14,000
Ludgershall Castle Primary School	flat roof	15,000
Ludwell Primary	flat roof b1	15,000
Lyneham Primary (ne. junior)	re-wire	150,000
Lyneham Primary (ne. junior)	flat roof b2	12,000
Marlborough St Peters Jnr.	boiler	35,000
Neston	boilers x3	80,000
Oxenwood	boiler	35,000
Pewsey Vale	heating	200,000
Salisbury St. Marks	re-wire	125,000

Stratford Sub Castle Primary	re-wire	50,000
Tidworth Clarendon Infants	flat roof	15,000
Tidworth Clarendon Jnr.	flat roof	9,000
Tidworth Clarendon Jnr.	pitched roof	70,000
Trowbridge Bellefield	floor stabilization C/T	20,000
Trowbridge Clarendon College	windows cladding (DT Block)	265,000
Trowbridge Clarendon College	flat roofs b1 (east block)	100,000
Trowbridge John o Gaunt School	flat roof b3 Dunston	175,000
Trowbridge John o Gaunt School	heating - Gloucester block	250,000
Trowbridge Longmeadow	boiler	35,000
Trowbridge Studley Green Primary	flat roof	18,000
Trowbridge Studley Green Primary	boiler	60,000
Warminster New Close	flat roof b1	23,000
Warminster New Close	boiler (kitchen)	35,000
Warminster Sambourne	re-wire	100,000
Warminster The Avenue	re-wire	190,000
Warminster The Avenue	flat roof	75,000
Westbury Junior	re-wire	170,000
Winsley	boiler	45,000
Wootton Bassett Longleaze	flat roof	240,000
Wootton Bassett Longleaze	boiler	35,000
		4,942,000

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 19th April

Subject: Replacement of Simdell Housing Management IT System

Cabinet member: Councillor John Brady – Economic Development,
Planning and Housing

Key Decision: Yes

Executive Summary

The current Simdell housing management application was procured from Simdell Ltd (latterly Aareon UK Ltd), and was implemented in 1998. Simdell was a dedicated housing product designed to support business areas of:

- Rent accounting
- Rent arrears
- Responsive repairs
- Property sales/Right to buy
- Lettings/Void management
- Multimedia/Mail-merge

The Simdell application has reached the end of its useful life. The product design is outdated and is no longer available to new customers.

The outmoded design of Simdell does not enable the council to demonstrate that Wiltshire meets many of the Audit Commission's performance indicators. This key shortcoming was underlined when housing failed to be awarded zero stars for performance by the Audit Commission inspection in February 2010.

There is no upgrade path from Simdell to Aareon's current housing product. Simdell is not a hierarchical database. It does not meet current technology standards, and fails to deliver open systems and web-enabled functionality.

The successful implementation of a new housing management system will enable Wiltshire Council to demonstrate that it exceeds many of the Audit Commission benchmark performance indicators. It will also allow housing staff to operate more effectively and to perform more responsively to changing requirements. It will also enable a better user interface.

A modern housing management application would also align with Wiltshire Council's IT and IM strategies. Funding for this development will be drawn from the Housing Revenue Account budget.

Proposal(s)

- That the committee be made aware of and endorse this project to improve services within the Housing Management Service, as set out in this document and the accompanying detailed business case
- That the committee be made aware of and approve the funding required for this development

Reason for Proposal(s)

The purpose of these proposals are twofold:

1. To brief and inform the committee on this development as set out in the business case
2. To approve the funding for the development.

Graham Hogg
Director of Housing

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 19th April

Subject: Replacement of Simdell Housing Management IT System

**Cabinet member: Councillor John Brady – Economic Development,
Planning and Housing**

Key Decision: Yes

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the committee of the need to replace the Simdell housing management system, and to brief on the requirements behind this project. The report also seeks approval to fund this project from the Housing Revenue Account.

Background

2. Wiltshire Council is responsible for social housing primarily in South Wiltshire. The current stock comprises:
 - 5,372 dwellings
 - 1,250 garages
 - 1,000 communal facilities (approx)

The housing management department is also responsible for the care and maintenance of leasehold land and flats within the South Wiltshire area. The Former Salisbury District area is the only part of Wiltshire Council with a retained housing stock. Social housing in other parts of the county is provided by housing associations.

The performance of housing management is currently as 'zero star' by the Audit Commission.

As a result of the Audit Commission report, housing management have developed an improvement plan which sets out a number of targets and areas for improvement. Key to the success of this improvement plan is the implementation of a modern housing management system, to support the service improvements and provide housing management staff with a high quality management and information system.

The current housing management system is 'Simdell', which was procured from Simdell Ltd (now Aareon UK Ltd), and was implemented in 1998. The design and structure of the system does not meet modern requirements in either information or technical requirements. Simdell is an uncustomisable

flat-file application. It is no longer available on the market and has a user base of less than five local authorities.

In order to address Simdell's shortcomings, a number of workarounds and ad hoc Access databases have been developed in-house. These temporary solutions need to be brought in to line with corporate standards and support requirements. Simdell is hosted on its own hardware environment, which is unsustainable in the modern, virtualised server environment.

Main Considerations for the Committee

3. The main considerations for the committee in this proposal are the limitations of the current housing management system:
 - a) the end of life of the product
 - c) the likely end of support to the product
 - d) the lack of public access afforded by the product and
 - e) the negative rating by the Audit Commission
 - f) its incompatibility with more up to date and efficient ways of working

Environmental and climate change considerations

4. The environmental or climate change impacts of this proposal, being a software implementation, are not particularly significant:
 - a) Due to improved power management systems, this virtualised environment that this system implementation will be hosted in, will result in a slightly lower degree of energy consumption, than the physical environment used by the legacy Simdell system, implemented in 1998.
 - b) The increased functionality of a more modern system will allow the opportunity for smarter working, and therefore enable Housing to minimise the amount of travel journeys that neighbourhood staff make.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

5. Modern housing management systems have enhanced public functions which grant secure access to a range of housing management functions. The current legacy system does not have this functionality. Enhanced features a new system would bring would include, but not be limited to:
 - a) Remote access of rent accounts
 - b) The ability to query, in detail, rent payments
 - c) The ability to make payments to deal with rent arrears
 - d) The ability to report defects and request repairs via the internet

Additionally the current system does not easily facilitate the storage and retrieval of data that would enable a better more tailored service to be offered to customers with special needs or who are vulnerable.

Risk Assessment

6. The project will be managed by an appointed Corporate IT project manager, who will manage the task, on behalf of a high-level project board. It will be the role of the project manager to identify project risks and issues, and produce mitigations for approval by the project board.
7. From a service aspect, continuing to use the legacy system presents risks to the housing directorate, in the areas of support, development and not enabling the service to improve its process and procedures, or deliver services and information to the public via the internet.

Financial Implications

8. The cost of implementation will be classified as capital expenditure. The total spend for the implementation, comprising software purchase, IT costs and project management costs is estimated at circa £0.500 million. The entire cost will be fully funded through a revenue contribution from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).
9. Revenue costs for the new system are likely to be in the region of £30,000 per annum which again will be met by the HRA. This estimate has been confirmed through a series of soft market testing presentations that have been held with system suppliers.

Legal Implications

10. The implemented system would meet the council's legal requirements with regard to Data Protection and current legislation.

Options Considered

15. The options considered, before deciding on replacing the legacy system were:

- a. Do nothing

This would require Wiltshire to continue operating a system that is inflexible, doesn't meet the changing business requirements and fails to allow members of the public/service users direct access to their information.

- b. Have Simdell developed to meet the business requirements

This option would be an expensive solution that would provide Wiltshire with functionality that an off-the-shelf solution would carry as standard.

Additionally, the revenue costs for such a development would be higher than the existing £50,000/year

c. Develop an in-house solution

An in-house solution could be developed, but the development time required to keep abreast of the changing social housing legislative requirements would be a significant call on IT resources

d. Procure an existing solution from a housing management system provider

This is the cheapest option, and the easiest to implement in a short timescale

e. Work with another landlord to jointly procure a system.

Regrettably there are no other local landlords that could either share an existing system with Wiltshire or could jointly procure in step with our timetable. However we do intend to set out our requirements in a way that will allow for the system to be made available to other providers should they decide to procure a system at a later date

Conclusions

16. It is noted that it is an absolute necessity to replace the existing system as it could well become obsolete very soon, additionally the functionality of the current system is seen as very poor and switching to a new IT system is key to achievement of the landlord service improvement plan and top quartile performance. It is therefore recommended that the Council chooses option (d) above and procures an existing solution from a housing management system provider whilst at the same time endeavouring to reduce costs by enabling the solution provided to be made available to other social housing landlords who may wish to procure at a later date.

Graham Hogg
Director of Housing

Report Author:

Brennig Jones, Business Analyst, ext 2625 / 07816 905 591

14th March 2011

Background Papers

Simdell Replacement Housing IT Management System Business Case (as attached).

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report:

Draft Timetable

Appendices

Appendix I: Simdell Replacement Housing IT Management System Business Case

This page is intentionally left blank



Simdell Replacement Housing IT Management System Business Case

Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	3
2. Project Objectives	4
3. Options	5
4. Procurement Options	6
5. Costs.....	7
6. Timescales	8
7. Risk Assessment.....	8
8. Success Measurement	9
9. Summary and Recommendations	9
10. Governance and Oversight.....	10
11. Document Control	10
12. Document sign-off:.....	10

1. Executive Summary

The Simdell housing application was procured from Simdell Ltd (latterly Aareon UK Ltd), and was implemented in 1998. Simdell was a dedicated housing product designed to support business areas of:

- Rent accounting
- Rent arrears
- Responsive repairs
- Property sales/Right to buy
- Lettings/Void management
- Multimedia/Mail-merge

The Simdell application has reached the end of its useful life. The product design is outdated and is no longer available to new customers.

The outmoded design of Simdell does not enable the council to demonstrate that Wiltshire meets any of the Audit Commission's performance indicators. This key shortcoming was underlined when housing failed to be awarded any stars by the most recent Audit Commission inspection.

There is no upgrade path from Simdell to Aareon's current housing product. Simdell is not a hierarchical database. It does not meet current technology standards, and fails to deliver open systems and web-enabled functionality.

The successful implementation of a new housing management system will enable Wiltshire Council to demonstrate that it exceeds many of the Audit Commission benchmark performance indicators. It will also allow housing staff to operate more effectively and to perform more responsively to changing requirements.

A modern housing management application would also align with Wiltshire Council's IT and IM strategies.

2. Project Objectives

2.1. Background

Wiltshire Council is responsible for social housing in the Salisbury district. The current stock comprises:

- 5,372 dwellings
- 1,250 garages
- 1,000 communal facilities (approx)

The housing management department is also responsible for the care and maintenance of leasehold land and flats within the Salisbury area. A medium to long term plan exists to build new council housing throughout the county. This will expand the housing stock.

The Salisbury area is the only part of Wiltshire Council with a retained housing stock. Social housing in other districts is provided by housing associations.

The performance of housing management is currently rated with a 'zero star' rating by the Audit Commission.

As a result of the Audit Commission report, housing management have developed an improvement plan which sets out a number of targets and areas for improvement. Key to the success of this improvement plan is the implementation of a modern housing management system, to support the service improvements and provide housing management staff with a high quality management and information system.

The current housing management system is 'Simdell', which was procured from Simdell Ltd (now Aareon UK Ltd), and was implemented in 1998. The design and structure of the system does not meet modern requirements in either information or technical requirements. Simdell is an uncustomisable flat-file application. It is no longer available on the market and has a user base of less than five local authorities.

In order to address Simdell's shortcomings, a number of workarounds and *ad hoc* Access databases have been developed in-house. These temporary solutions need to be brought in to line with corporate standards and support requirements. Simdell is hosted on its own hardware environment, which is unsustainable in the modern, virtualised server environment.

2.2. Requirements

Housing management require a new information system to replace the legacy Simdell application. Simdell does not meet or support the business needs, it will restrict the Council's ability to react to change and will not support service improvements in a proactive manner. The continued use of Simdell will also inhibit the business as it attempts to achieve top quartile performance, as laid out in the housing improvement plan.

3. Options

A number of options have been considered by the housing management team. These are:

Option	Comment
1. Do nothing	<p>The current system fails to deliver key 'business as usual' (BAU) functions</p> <p>The current system is no longer provided to new customers by the solution provider</p> <p>The user-base of Simdell users is shrinking</p> <p>The possible cessation of support for Simdell is likely</p> <p>Summary: Option 1 is unsustainable and would clearly fail the business.</p>
2. Have Simdell developed to meet Wiltshire's needs	<p>Aareon UK Ltd has confirmed that only user group funding for commissioned development will be considered. Wiltshire are unlikely to get the entire user group to fund system changes to benefit Wiltshire's needs</p> <p>Commissioning development work through the user group would be a costly option that would bring extremely lengthy lead times for delivery</p> <p>Integration of a developed version of Simdell with corporate applications would further complicate a complex task and would extend the testing process to other areas</p> <p>Summary: Option 2 is not a practical alternative. It would be an expensive route. Option 2 would not offer a future-proofed solution. It would fail to offer future growth and would not be able to support a changing service without a continuing development path</p>
3. Develop an in-house solution	<p>The lead-time to specify, design and build an in-house system that met all of the Housing requirements would be extraordinarily lengthy. In-house development time would be a significant factor, and a considerable drain on IT development.</p> <p>Summary: This would be a financially costly alternative that would take years to fully implement.</p>
4. Procure a solution from an existing Housing system providers	<p>This option would deliver a tried and tested Housing application that met Wiltshire's requirements in all of the key business areas.</p> <p>Summary: This option would give Wiltshire an off-the-shelf, fit for purpose housing management system, provided by experienced application providers, delivered to a fixed budget and timescale.</p>

4. Procurement Options

In the interests of looking for the most economical procurement model, the housing management team have considered two possible scenarios.

4.1. Procurement option with Poole Housing Partnership

Poole Housing Partnership (PHP) are in the early stages of considering a replacement housing management system. Wiltshire and PHP have had a number of discussions to share information on business, technical and system requirements. These include:

- Members of PHP attending a series of pre-procurement demonstrations at Bourne Hill, from various housing management system suppliers
- A Wiltshire council business analyst visiting PHP to help draft their requirements documentation

Although the requirements of Wiltshire and PHP are broadly similar, and could be brought closer together through some process re-engineering, the timescales of the two organisations do not converge. At this time, PHP are up to a year behind Wiltshire. Wiltshire's requirement has a higher degree of urgency driving it.

PHPs requirement, being broadly similar, could be accommodated in a shared system at a later stage.

A more practical approach would be for Wiltshire to implement a new housing management system in a more immediate timescale. Wiltshire staff could use the time to gain key skills in operating and administering the product. PHP could join the new system at a later stage, and benefit from the in-house expertise gained by Wiltshire staff. This would allow PHP to save money against the usual consultancy fees during product implementation.

Recommendation: That Wiltshire and PHP continue their dialogue through the procurement, planning and implementation phases, to enable PHP to migrate, at a later stage, to an external 'hosted' housing management solution provided by Wiltshire council, if so required.

4.2. Procurement methodology

Wiltshire council have two procurement methodologies to choose from. These are:

- a. Full OJEU tender, and
- b. Buying Solutions framework

There are a number of advantages and disadvantages to both options. These are set out below.

4.3. Full OJEU tender:

This is a comprehensive, open-to-all procurement method that begins with an invitation to tender advertisement being placed in European journals. Although this all-embracing approach could gain significant interest, the comprehensive nature of this approach means that a significant amount of time needs to be invested in managing the procurement pipeline and reducing the number of responses to a workable shortlist. Reducing the shortlist further to a single, chosen supplier would add further time to the process. Procuring a system through a full OJEU tender would extend the time of delivery in to two years before 'go live'.

4.4. Buying Solutions framework:

This is a streamlined procurement framework managed by the national partner for all UK public services purchasing and is part of the Efficiency and Reform Group within the Cabinet Office. Buying Solutions provides public sector organisations with a shortlist of pre-approved software providers grouped by area of business speciality. The pre-approved list of specialist suppliers does not include one supplier Wiltshire and PHP have seen demonstrated, but all others would be included. Procuring a system through the Buying Solutions framework would put the likely time to 'go live' in to 12-18 months.

Recommendation: That Wiltshire adopt the Buying Solutions framework for the procurement of the Simdell replacement product.

5. Costs

5.1. Estimated purchasing costs

Based on the software demonstrations that Wiltshire and PHP have received, and mindful of the full specification of requirements, it is likely that the purchase price for the Simdell replacement, including external consultancy costs, would be not more than £500,000.

5.2. Resource assessment

Internal resources for the delivery of this project will be drawn from housing staff, with additional support from corporate IT.

This project will be run by a project team which would deal with the day-to-day progress, risk and issue reporting, escalation and resolution, and task progress of the project plan. The project team is likely to meet at least weekly and will also manage communications within the council in general and within the user community in particular.

The project team will be overseen by a Governance and Oversight project board, to ensure that costs remain in line with the initial projections as set out in the Project Implementation Document (PID), and that risks and issues are contained, that benefits are managed and that the plan remains faithful to the scope and timescale.

The governance and oversight board is likely to meet monthly.

The proposed constitution of the governance and oversight board is:

- Project sponsor/Senior responsible officer
- Project manager
- Solution provider rep
- Wiltshire corporate IT rep
- Senior housing user
- Stakeholder

The proposed constitution of the project team is:

- Project manager
- Solution provider rep
- Wiltshire corporate IT rep
- Senior housing user
- Housing staff (reps drawn from multiple business areas/sections)

5.3. Costs

The full cost of procuring and implementing a replacement housing management system will be met by Housing Management from the ring-fenced housing revenue account

6. Timescales

The indicative timescales in this Pre-PID business case are for completion of the project within one year, as indicated in the following table:

Milestone / Stage	Start Date	End Date
Business Case	25/09/2010	01/10/2010
Tender Document		
Award Tender		
Test install and data transfer	01/07/2011	30/09/2010
Go live	01/10/2011	

7. Risk Assessment

No extraordinary risks apply in the delivery of this project. Security of information and data will be protected by strict adherence of Wiltshire's security policy. All aspects of the project will comply with Wiltshire's Health & Safety and Risk Awareness policy.

Daily project management and risk/issue reporting will identify known/unknown and potential problems, and report these to the project board for categorisation, prioritisation, logging and mitigation.

8. Success Measurement

Appropriate success measures for this project would include:

- The successful data transfer of existing data from Simdell
- The successful data transfer from interim third party applications and data sources
- The completed, successful roll-out of the new solution to all areas of housing
- A comprehensive range of reports produced by the new solution
- On-time, on-budget delivery of the project and, ultimately
- Achievement of top quartile performance as laid out in the housing improvement plan.

9. Summary and Recommendations

The successful delivery of a new housing management system will benefit corporate goals and opportunities as set out in the current housing business improvement plan. These include offering:

- A client- (applicant and/or tenant) based approach to housing management functions
- A single housing management system, as opposed to multiple systems, as currently utilised
- A higher level of proactivity in supporting business requirements, rather than reactive approach currently taken
- A more intuitive use of technology that reflects changing practices, not dated practices as dictated by legacy systems
- Contractors and staff being able to access services online – currently not an option in Simdell. Government guidelines recommend online solutions
- Raising housing management services to the current level of technology
- Reduce housing management costs through adopting a more agile, flexible method
- A high quality, low cost, customer focused services
- A more transparent decision making process to housing management officers.

This business case recommends that progress is made to deliver a procured solution from specialist application providers as outlined in Option 4.

10. Governance and Oversight

10.1. Project Team

As discussed in Para 4.1 (Resource Assessment), a project team will need to be convened. The function of this team is to combine a 'hands on' approach to driving the project forward, dealing with risks and issues, task planning and reviewing progress reports and RAG reports

10.2. Project Governance and Oversight Board

The governance and oversight board exists at a strategic level to ensure the project complies with its terms and conditions, matches the project plan, deals with risks and issues as escalated by the project team and ensures that the project stays within financial constraints. The chair of the governance and oversight board may be required to report to committee or sub-committee, on project progress, as requested.

The chair of the governance and oversight board for procurement projects of this size is usually a Head of Service/Director of Service.

11. Document Control

11.1. Revision History

Version	Summary of Changes	Status	Date published
1.0	First Draft	Draft	27 th Sept 2010
2.0	Second Draft	Final Draft	30 th Sept 2010
3.0	Third Draft	Final Draft	7 th Oct 2010
4.0	4 th Draft	Final Draft	13 th Oct 2010
4.1	5 th Draft to reflect updated content	Pending	14 th Jan 2011
5.0	Previous draft edited to reflect draft costs	Pending	3 rd Feb 2011

11.2. RACI

Issued To	Title	RACI
Deborah Farrow	ICT Service Director	Responsible
Paul Hemingway	Head of Business Support	Accountable
Andy Spurway	Head of ICT Applications	Consulted
Glen Holmes	Head of Design & Delivery	Consulted
Tom James	Head of Information Management	Consulted
Chris Christensen	Security	Consulted
David L Jones	Business Analyst	Consulted
Brennig Jones	Business Analyst	Editor

12. Document sign-off:

Head of Service/Sponsor:		Date:	
Head of IT:		Date:	

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

19 April 2011

Subject: 24, 26 and 28 Endless Street Salisbury - Business Case for Use by Wiltshire Coroner

Cabinet member: John Noeken – Resources

Key Decision: No

Executive Summary

Wiltshire Council currently exercises its statutory power to “provide and maintain proper accommodation for the holding of inquests in their area” (Section 31 Coroners Act 1988) in providing the Coroner with a small court room in Castle Street, Salisbury with accompanying office accommodation, and the use of the Trowbridge Town Hall for jury inquests.

Having taken over the contracts of employment of the coroner’s staff from the coroner, Wiltshire Council has a duty of care towards them as its employees. The Salisbury premises have been assessed and are not suitable for the needs of the service and do not meet health and safety standards. The council is seeking to dispose of Trowbridge Town Hall as part of the capital asset programme.

This proposal is for premises that would replace the current provision of the small court and office accommodation (currently in the centre of Salisbury) and the large court (currently in Trowbridge) with a single facility, to be located in 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury.

This proposal has been drawn up in consultation with the senior Coroner for Wiltshire, and takes his views into account.

Proposal(s)

- (i) To remove 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury, from the schedule of capital assets to be disposed of by the council.
- (ii) To separate 24 Endless Street from number 26 and dispose of 24 Endless Street on the open market for residential development.
- (iii) To convert 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury to provide accommodation for the Wiltshire Coroner’s service, to include 2 court rooms and office accommodation.
- (iv) To dispose of Trowbridge Town Hall as part of the capital asset disposal

programme.

Reason for Proposal(s)

The proposals are the result of an assessment of options available to Wiltshire Council in exercising its statutory powers in respect of the County Coroner's accommodation. This is set out in detail in the report and at Appendix I.

Ian Gibbons

Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

CABINET CAPITAL ASSETS COMMITTEE

19 April 2011

Subject: 24, 26 and 28 Endless Street Salisbury - Business Case for Use by Wiltshire Coroner

Cabinet member: John Noeken – Resources

Key Decision: No

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 Local authorities have a statutory power to “provide and maintain proper accommodation for the holding of inquests in their area” (Section 31 Coroners Act 1988).
- 1.2 Wiltshire Council currently exercises that power by providing the Coroner with a small court room in Castle Street, Salisbury with accompanying office accommodation, and the use of the Trowbridge Town Hall for jury inquests.
- 1.3 If Wiltshire Council decides not to exercise the power to provide the accommodation directly, it has a duty to provide the Coroner with sufficient funding to procure and maintain suitable accommodation. In order better to manage the costs associated with the service and to achieve the best economies of scale available, it is preferable to exercise the power to provide and maintain proper accommodation directly.
- 1.4 The former Wiltshire Coroner secured his own accommodation by way of renting premises in Castle Street, Salisbury, from which the service provided a small court room and office accommodation for the support staff, who became directly employed by Wiltshire Council in 2009. These premises are supplemented by exclusive use of Trowbridge Town Hall for the conduct of jury inquests, those attracting a significant degree of public interest, and military inquests.
- 1.5 The coroner is the tenant of the Salisbury accommodation – Wiltshire Council paid the rent. The lease will expire in June 2011 although we have now obtained in principle agreement to its extension.
- 1.6 Wiltshire Council, having taken over the contracts of employment of the coroner’s staff from the coroner, has a duty of care towards them as its employees. The Salisbury premises have been assessed and are not suitable for the needs of the service and do not meet health and safety

standards. The council is seeking to dispose of Trowbridge Town Hall as part of the capital asset programme.

- 1.7 We therefore need to provide suitable accommodation to replace both the Salisbury premises and Trowbridge Town Hall.
- 1.8 This proposal is for premises that would replace the current provision of the small court and office accommodation (currently in the centre of Salisbury) and the large court (currently in Trowbridge) with a single facility, to be located in 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury.
- 1.9 This proposal has been drawn up in consultation with the senior Coroner for Wiltshire, and takes his views into account.

2. Background

Current Premises

- 2.1 Wiltshire Council currently exercises their power to maintain and provide proper accommodation by leasing a small court room in Castle Street, Salisbury with accompanying office accommodation, and providing the use of the Trowbridge Town Hall for jury inquests.
- 2.2 The Castle Street premises are rented from the private sector under a sub-lease from Lloyds Bank. The premises are not DDA compliant and do not meet health and safety standards. It would be difficult and expensive to bring them up to an acceptable DDA and H&S specification, not least because the building is Grade II listed. They are too small for our requirements and cannot be extended. For these reasons, it is not practical to seek an extension of the lease on anything other than a very short-term basis.
- 2.3 Trowbridge Town Hall is owned by Wiltshire Council. It is used only for the conduct of inquests requiring a jury, or those in which there is significant public interest resulting in a large press and public presence. It is not used for any other purpose. The building is in a poor state of repair, and is expensive to heat and maintain. The council is seeking to dispose of the Town Hall as part of the capital asset programme. Retaining it simply for the use of the coroner for the conduct of inquests is not cost-effective in anything other than the extremely short term.

Staff

- 2.4 There are currently 4 full time members of staff based Castle Street: HM Coroner and 3 administrative officers. The administrative officers are employees of Wiltshire Council, but are specialist staff with many years of experience in handling coronial work.
- 2.5 There are 5 deputy and assistant deputy coroners, who are solicitors in private practice who work part time as deputy Coroners. The majority of them are based in firms in Salisbury. They use the Castle Street

premises on an ad hoc basis to prepare for and hold inquests, as well as travelling to Trowbridge Town Hall to conduct inquests there.

- 2.6 There are 4 coronial officers who are currently employed by the police, but who work closely with the coroner and his administrative team. They frequently use the Castle Street office as a “touch down” area. They attend inquests in Salisbury, Swindon and Trowbridge.
- 2.7 The Coroners and Justice Act 2009 introduces the new statutory function of Medical Examiner. The ME would be an NHS employee, but would work directly with the Coroner. The ME would probably employ 2 full time administrative officers. It would be desirable to provide accommodation for the ME with the Coroner – the council could consider charging the NHS rent for this provision. The use of shared accommodation would have operational advantages, and may also benefit the service financially by reducing the number of post mortems that need to be conducted.

Current accommodation costs

- 2.8 The running costs of the Salisbury premises are approximately £18,000 per annum, including overheads.
- 2.9 The annual cost for the use of Trowbridge Town Hall is circa £25,000.
- 2.10 The total annual cost of both premises is therefore £43,000.

3. Main Considerations for the Committee

- 3.1 This proposal is for premises that would replace the current provision of the small court and office accommodation (currently in the centre of Salisbury) and the large court (currently in Trowbridge) with a single facility, to be located in 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury.
- 3.2 24, 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury are owned by Wiltshire Council. It has been estimated that if sold they would realise an estimated £670,000. They have been scheduled for disposal as part of the capital asset programme.
- 3.3 The premises were extended and adapted, primarily over the course of the early-to mid 20th century, to provide a council chamber and office accommodation. The internal floor plan of number 24 and 28 is very difficult to disentangle. Property services have advised that in today’s difficult property market the floor plan and internal structure of these two buildings, coupled with their Grade II listed status, would render them difficult to dispose of.
- 3.4 However, the features of these two buildings that are likely to be unattractive as a commercial proposition are features that make them particularly suited, with relatively minor adjustments, to the function of a court and ancillary office accommodation.

3.5 The accommodation available in numbers 26 and 28 would be sufficient to meet the coroner's requirements. Number 24 is relatively discrete from the other two buildings, and could be separated with only minor structural alterations. Property services officers advise that number 24 is most likely to achieve a reasonable selling price if placed on the market with change of use to a residential property. It would be possible to make it more attractive by granting a right of way across the car park to the rear of the building, the allocation of (say) two dedicated parking bays, and the provision of a small area of land to the rear for a courtyard garden. These are likely to render number 24 an attractive and highly marketable proposition.

4. Planning Considerations

4.1 Any alterations to these premises will require Listed Buildings Consent. Early discussions with conservation officers indicate that the change of use to a court is likely to be appropriate in conservation terms. The alterations needed to meet DDA standards can be achieved without significant changes to the fabric of the buildings, and most of the proposed changes would result in an enhancement of the internal features that were the primary reasons for the buildings' original listed status.

4.2 Property services officers have advised that it may be difficult for developers to obtain consent for the kind of alterations that would be necessary in order to render numbers 26 and 28 a commercially attractive development proposition.

4.3 Numbers 26 and 28 are overlooked by the windows of residential flats on the adjacent street. Advice from planning officers is that there may be difficulties in obtaining planning consent for a residential re-development in the car park at the rear of the Endless Street site, thus reducing its attractiveness to potential purchasers as a development opportunity.

4.4 Property services officers advise that the separation of number 24 from numbers 26 and 28 could be achieved with relatively few changes to the internal structure and fabric of the buildings, so Listed Buildings Consent is not likely to be problematic.

5. Environmental and climate change considerations

5.1 There is a large temporary building serving as an extension to the rear of the Endless Street premises. It has been used as office accommodation. The extension is surplus to the Coroner's requirements. The insulation on the extension is sub-standard, so it is expensive to heat and is not energy efficient. The temporary building has been in place for considerably longer than the anticipated lifespan for a temporary structure and is in some disrepair.

5.2 This proposal includes the removal of the temporary building extension, which would not be replaced. This will reduce the carbon footprint of the

Endless Street premises. The remainder of the proposal is neutral in environmental terms.

6. Equalities Impact of the Proposal

None.

7. Risk Assessment

7.1 If we do not secure suitable accommodation to replace the current provision there is a risk that the council will fail in its statutory duty to ensure that proper accommodation is available for the Coroner to hold inquests in the area of his jurisdiction.

7.2 The risks of not providing suitable accommodation compliant with health and safety standards are that the council may be liable, as an employer, for foreseeable adverse consequences to the well-being of the staff employed in the coroner's service.

7.3 The loss to the capital asset programme of a proportion of the anticipated proceeds from the sale of the Endless Street premises may have an adverse effect on the council's ability to finance other services. However, this must be offset against the higher cost of needing to find a significant and currently unfunded revenue stream to provide accommodation in the private rented sector.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 The status quo is not an option in anything other than the very short term, because of the expiry of the head lease and the unsuitability of the premises currently being used. However, for information purposes, the current annual cost of the Castle Street and Town Hall premises is around £44,000.

8.2 Wiltshire Council has a statutory power to provide accommodation for the Coroner, or (should it choose not to exercise that power) a statutory duty to provide the Coroner with funds to acquire his own accommodation.

8.3 Given that the status quo is not an option, the choices are:

- a. To accommodate the courts and office premises within one of the 4 hubs;
- b. to rent alternative premises on the open market;
- c. to provide accommodation from within the Council's existing portfolio currently designated for disposal;

These are explained and assessed under 'Options Considered'.

9. Legal Implications

9.1 As set out in the Executive Summary and the body of the report.

10. Options Considered

Option A - The Hubs:

10.1 As part of earlier consideration of the location of the coronial service which took place with the outgoing coroner and with the present coroner very early in his tenure, officers looked at the possibility of providing alternative accommodation at Browfort or in County Hall. Neither of these options is viable.

10.2 The coroner requires frequent access to a suitable venue to use as a court room (in practice, council chambers) and additional rooms close by for relatives and their legal representatives. The pressure on meeting rooms and council chambers for the conduct of Wiltshire Council business means that the provision of court facilities as often as 3-4 times a week renders this unfeasible.

10.3 In addition, in the course of these early considerations all of the coronial support staff have indicated that they would not be willing to relocate from Salisbury. That being the case, we would have to recruit and train an entirely new team, which would essentially render the service unable to function for at least 6 months, and functioning at well below optimum levels for at least 18 months thereafter.

10.4 The relocation of Wiltshire Council staff to the hubs means that these premises are already working to capacity and it would be extremely difficult to identify self-contained office accommodation for the Coroner and his team within the hub offices. Furthermore, the Coroner, whose views we are required to take into account, has expressed the view that it is unsatisfactory for the service to be co-located with council services since it is important for him to be clearly independent of the council in the provision of his functions.

10.5 For these reasons this option is not viable.

Option B - Renting on the open market

10.6 Based on a current open market rental price of £130 per m² per annum (comparing like for like – i.e., refurbished premises with parking in Salisbury), the annual cost of renting suitable premises from the private sector would be in the region £78,000.

10.7 Over the medium to long term this option is significantly more expensive than Option C (see attached spreadsheet at **Appendix I**).

Option C – Providing accommodation from the capital asset portfolio

- 10.8 24, 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury are owned by Wiltshire Council. It has been estimated that if sold they would realise an estimated £670,000. They have been scheduled for disposal as part of the capital asset programme.
- 10.9 Advice about this option has been sought from property services officers and conservation officers.
- 10.10 The premises were extended and adapted, primarily over the course of the early-to mid 20th century, to provide a council chamber and office accommodation. The internal floor plan of numbers 26 - 28 is very difficult to disentangle. Advice from property services officers is that in today's difficult property market the floor plan and internal structure of these two buildings, coupled with their Grade II listed status, would render them relatively difficult to dispose of.
- 10.11 However, the features of these two buildings that are likely to be unattractive as a commercial proposition are features that make them particularly suited, with relatively minor adjustments, to the function of a court and ancillary office accommodation.
- 10.12 The accommodation available in numbers 26 and 28 would be sufficient to meet the coroner's requirements. Number 24 is relatively discrete from the other two buildings, and could be separated with only minor structural alterations. Property services officers have advised that number 24 is most likely to achieve a reasonable selling price if placed on the market with change of use to a residential property. It would be possible to make it more attractive by granting a right of way across the car park to the rear of the building, the allocation of (say) two dedicated parking bays, and the provision of a small area of land to the rear for a courtyard garden. These are likely to render number 24 an attractive and highly marketable proposition.

11. Conclusions

- 11.1 In light of the above, it is recommended that the Cabinet Capital Assets Committee act:
- (i) To remove 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury, from the schedule of capital assets to be disposed of by the council.
 - (ii) To separate 24 Endless Street from number 26 and dispose of 24 Endless Street on the open market for residential development.
 - (iii) To convert 26 and 28 Endless Street, Salisbury to provide accommodation for the Wiltshire Coroner's service, to include 2 court rooms and office accommodation.
 - (iv) To dispose of Trowbridge Town Hall as part of the capital asset disposal programme.

Ian Gibbons

Service Director, Legal & Democratic Services

Report Author:

Nina Wilton, Head of Governance

6 April 2011

Background Papers

None.

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report:

None.

Appendices

Appendix I: Analysis of Coroners Options

Analysis of Coroners options

Revenue impact Capital impact

Current accommodation costs

Rent for offices and small court in Castle Street	18,000	current costs
Trowbridge Town Hall	24,810	current costs
Disposal of 24-28 Endless Street		-670,000 capital receipt
Total current accommodation cost	42,810	-670,000

Option 1 - Move all accommodation to Endless Street, Dispose of Trowbridge Town Hall

Loss to capital asset programme of 23 & 26 Endless St		520,000
Gain to capital asset programme from disposal of Trowbridge Town Hall - unplanned disposal		0 assumed proceeds outweighed by costs of sale to get the building into a fit state
Net loss to capital asset programme		520,000
Effect of loss of capital receipt - borrowing & MRP cost to council	33,800	new cost - effect of not receiving the full disposal proceeds additional borrowing required
Saving on rent for offices and small court in Castle Street	-18,000	
savings on maintenance of Trowbridge Town Hall	-24,810	assuming it is disposed of
Net year 1 cost of Option 2	-9,010	
5 year cost of Option 1	-45,050	520,000
10 year cost of Option 1	-90,100	520,000

Page 57

Option 2 - Rent small court and office accommodation in Salisbury (private sector rental) Retain Trowbridge Town Hall for jury inquests

Cost of accommodation in Salisbury (500 m2)	78,000	
Cost of Trowbridge Town Hall	24,810	
Loss to capital asset programme of Trowbridge Town Hall		0
Net year 1 cost of Option 2	102,810	0
5 year cost of Option 2	514,050	0
10 year cost of Option 2	1,028,100	0

Option 3 - Rent accommodation for 2 courts and offices in Salisbury (private sector rental) Dispose of Trowbridge Town Hall

Rent for courts and offices	84,000	
Disposal of Trowbridge Town Hall		0
Net Year 1 cost of Option 3	84,000	0
5 year cost of Option 3	420,000	0
10 year cost of Option 3	840,000	0

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank