

CAMPUS & OPERATIONAL DELIVERY TASK GROUP

NOTES OF THE CAMPUS & OPERATIONAL DELIVERY TASK GROUP MEETING HELD ON 11 OCTOBER AT COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE

Present:

Cllr Deane, Cllr Howard, Cllr Jeans, Cllr Rooke, Cllr Seed (Chairman of the meeting)

Also Present:

Cllr Wheeler

Andy Brown, Teresa Goddard, Henry Powell, Mark Stone

Apologies

Cllr Carter (Chairman)

1. The Cabinet Member for Campus Development and Culture, the Service Director for Transformation and the Head of Finance attended to introduce the evidence provided and answer members' questions. It was noted that the final reports to Cabinet might contain marginally different figures than the versions provided to the Task Group but any differences would not be material.
2. It was noted that Cllr Carter, Chairman of the Task Group (who had given his apologies for the meeting) had already met with the Service Director for Transformation to discuss the reports provided.
3. The Task Group did not feel they had sufficient time or information to undertake detailed scrutiny of the projects proposed within the report. The Cabinet Member reported that the Task Group had received the reports as soon as they were produced. The limited time available was a consequence of the project's 'bottom-up approach' whereby local communities are designing the facilities they want. The Community Operations Boards (COBs) have needed to finalise their proposals before the Cabinet Member can take requests to Cabinet for the necessary funding. The Cabinet Member's request of the Task Group was to provide a check on the approach being taken and the proposals within the report.
4. The process for this second tranche of campus projects differed slightly from the first in that there has been a better understanding of the funding

requirements and architectural designs of each campus at an earlier stage. The Cabinet Member reported that there was unlikely to be significant changes in the approach for future tranches, but it was a gradual learning process and officers were benefiting from their experience. It was also recognised that every campus, Area Board and COB are different so a unique approach must be taken for each.

5. The Cabinet Member will be recommending that Cabinet adopt the enhanced options for all four campuses within the second tranche. The Cabinet Member emphasised that conditions for borrowing were favourable at the moment so this was the appropriate time to be making the investments proposed.
6. The proportion of funding allocated to each community area's campus is broadly in line with the funding pattern for the Leisure Review, which was approved by Council.
7. It was clarified that major maintenance would be covered under projects' 'Capital costs', rather than under the 'Maintenance costs' listed within the financial details.
8. It was reported that town and parish council precepts would not increase as a direct result of the campus proposals, except where campus projects have incorporated historic town/parish council projects that would have increased precepts anyway.
9. The Task Group noted that the campus projects were not comparable with PFI projects as the former required straight forward capital borrowing without any element of profit.
10. The Task Group noted that 'Net Present Value' (NPV), the figure taken for the overall value or price of the campus projects within the reports, was an established method for evaluating long-term projects in capital budgeting.
11. Royal Wootton Bassett's campus project is no longer included in the second tranche. This is because the Area Board has an aspiration to secure an ambitious rebuild of an existing facility, which will require collaboration with other agencies and discussions regarding this are ongoing.

Conclusion

The Task Group took an overview of the reports being taken to Cabinet within the time available. Members were satisfied with the process that had been followed, including the make-up and method of calculating the financial figures for the proposed campus projects.