

**PROPOSED DRAFT CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR 2010/11 – 2012/13**

**EXECUTIVE MEMBER:** Cllr Elaine Woodburn  
**LEAD OFFICER:** Liam Murphy, Chief Executive  
**LEAD HEAD OF** Julie Crellin, Head of Finance and Management  
**SERVICE:** Information Systems  
**REPORT AUTHOR:** Ann Treble, Capital Accountant

**Summary:**

This report provides the RPWG with a draft summary of the Capital Programme 2010/11-2012/13, and demonstrates how the proposed bids meet the key corporate priorities.

**Recommendation:**

- (i) RPWG are asked to consider the new capital bids presented and make recommendations for the inclusion in the draft Capital Programme for executive to approve in February 2010.
- (ii) RPWG is asked to consider the funding of the Housing Capital Programme, in particular the use of residual right to buy and VAT sharing receipts.
- (iii) RPWG is asked to note the proposed draft capital programme for 2010/11 /2012/13, can be funded from capital receipts reserve, but this assumes £7,596,500 of capital receipts are realised in the three year period.

**1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Effective asset management planning is a crucial corporate activity to ensure we meet our corporate and service aims, and deliver our services.
- 1.2 This paper details the draft Capital Bids put forward, for inclusion in the Capital Programme for 2010/11 and beyond, as well as the existing Capital Programme for 2010/11, 2011/12, to give the proposed capital

programme for the three years 2010/11-2012/13, and how they will be funded.

- 1.3 When considering approval of capital bids, we need to ensure that:-
- our spending decisions are meeting our key priorities
  - we would not fail to meet our statutory duties if a scheme was not approved
  - consideration has been given to sources of funding available
  - we have maximised external funding on all bids (where appropriate)
  - all revenue costs/savings as well as capital costs have been considered
- 1.4 The draft capital bids included in the programme have been prepared by Service managers and Heads of Service. Finance has reviewed the draft bids to consider if the resulting spend is of a capital nature and is therefore appropriate to be included in any considerations for the programme.
- 1.5 The draft capital bids have been reviewed with the Service Managers to explore all sources of finance and, external sources of finance have been used wherever possible.

## **2 OPTIONS**

- 2.1 A summary of the draft Capital Programme for the years 2010-2013 is shown in appendix A.
- 2.2 Appendix B demonstrates how the proposed bids meet the key corporate priorities as detailed in para 1.3.  
It also separates the bids between:
- NEW bids (detailed bid in appendices 1-11),
  - No bids (12-14 no appendices)
  - EXISTING SCHEMES BUT AMENDMENT REQUIRED (appendices 15-17) and
  - EXISTING SCHEMES NO CHANGE (18-27 these bids have all been previously approved by Executive and as there are no changes, the appendices have NOT been included in this report).
- The bids for the three year period total £7,062,365.

## **3 FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING SOURCES OF FINANCE)**

- 3.1 Table 1 below shows the sources of funding for draft Capital Programme for the three years 2010-2013. It is important that the funding of the proposed Capital Programme is fully understood and can be

demonstrated. This should contribute to RPWG's confidence in recommending the draft capital programme (in whole or part).

- 3.2 The proposed 2010/11- 2012/13 capital programme expenditure can be financed as follows:

**Table 1: Financing of the proposed 2010/11- 2012/13 Capital Programme**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
<b>Funded by:</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Useable Capital Receipts	(1,564,015)	(1,327,950)	(1,027,800)
Useable Capital Receipts - Preserved right to buy sales (post stock transfer)	(628,685)		
Useable Capital Receipts - Residual Right to Buy receipts (pre stock transfer)			
Useable Capital Receipts - Crematorium Sinking Fund	(168,550)		
Other External Funding	(880,975)	(738,000)	(714,760)
Other Reserves & contributions	(6,195)	(6,195)	
<b>TOTAL FINANCING</b>	<b>(3,248,420)</b>	<b>(2,072,145)</b>	<b>(1,741,800)</b>

- 3.3 There may be future funding demands from Albion Square, Pow Beck and Millom Pool projects, on the useable capital receipts reserve, although this is as yet, unknown. It is hoped that all future spend on these projects will be fully funded externally, but at this early stage this cannot be guaranteed. There is no monetary provision in either the proposed capital programme as detailed in Appendix A or within the funding requirements as detailed in Table 1. RPWG will be informed when and if a funding requirement emerges before finalisation of the budget recommendation to Executive in February 2010.
- 3.4 It is expected that Copeland will be approached to act as the accountable body for the Haverigg Lighthouse project. It is envisaged that this would involve demolition of the existing building, replacing it with a new build children's centre, which would be partly on our land, though not our asset. It is expected that all funding will be externally provided and therefore no monetary provision has been made in either the proposed capital programme as detailed in Appendix A or within the funding requirements as detailed in Table 1.
- 3.5 The extension of Millom Cemetery is currently included in the capital programme (approved in February 2009). The approved bid is £150,000 to purchase land required to extend the existing facility (profiled over 3 years). Since this bid was approved, the possibility of acquiring land at St George's Park, Millom, in exchange for the maintenance of the remaining park has arisen. It is however, possible that the land would not be suitable for burial purposes, due to high water table near sea level. Members,

however, asked for additional information on this possibility and this is included in a resubmitted bid in Appendix 16. Members are asked to note that the draft Capital Programme includes the original bid value i.e. £150,000 less £5,000 included in current year, and a reduction to this is not sought.

- 3.6 The high demand for private sector renewal housing assistance, residents continuing requirement for Disabled Facilities Grant support (both of which target vulnerable residents to improve their private dwellings to ensure quality of life and decency standards) and Copeland's strategic approach to bringing empty homes back into use, requires a level of funding which is unlikely to be met by external funding in the coming three years, due to the anticipated reduction in our regional housing grant

In 2009/10 the DCLG regional housing grant (main source of external finance) was reduced by over £300,000 (from £1.175m to £842k) and it is anticipated that the award will be further reduced next year, best average estimate being £504k. Lobbying, led by Barrow Borough Council, on behalf of Cumbrian authorities is underway and Copeland is actively supporting this.

This bid is for £696k and requests the use firstly of the Preserved Rights to Buy reserve (forecast opening balance for 1 April 2010, as at Quarter 2 2009/10 of £628k) which has previous Member approval for this use, and secondly £68k from Useable Capital Receipts Reserve (in lieu of a pending decision re the use of Residual Right to Buy and VAT Sharing Receipt Reserves as per recommendation (ii)). £696k is also requested for 2011/12 and 2012/13 (again currently utilising Useable Capital Receipts reserve pending a decision re the use of Residual rights to Buy and VAT Sharing Receipt reserves as per recommendation (ii))

A six month review of Copeland's new Housing Assistance Policy, which was launched in April 2009, is currently in progress to ensure continued effective targeting to our most vulnerable households and this will be considered at the Strategic Housing Panel in December 2009. Members are reminded that we need to fulfill our statutory duties, with regard to providing Disabled Facilities Grants, and this must take precedence over the allocation of funding to be used in fulfillment of our powers, regarding Housing Renewal Grants/Loans. Appendix B provides details of anticipated demand matched against anticipated funding.

- 3.7 Surveys, Cleaning, Repairs and Adopt drains bid remains unaltered except for the seeking of approval to re-profile some of this budget from the current year into 2010/11 and 2011/12. A paper tabled by the Environmental Health Manager at this meeting provides further detail. The re-profiling of this budget will then eliminate the forecast under spend in

2009/10, on this project that was reported in Quarter 2 Capital Monitoring Report (as the current year budget will then match the forecast spend).

- 3.8 At it's meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> October, 2009, Executive approved the inclusion of the Revenue and Benefits system, at £215,000, in the capital programme for 2010/11. There is some drawdown expected on this project during the current year, but as yet, this has not been quantified. The figure will be reported to Executive in the Quarter 3 Capital Monitoring report.
- 3.9 A contribution to WCDF of £62,000 has been included for the three years 2010-2013. This sum has been paid for a number of years but a 'payment holiday' was taken this year. Whilst it is an existing bid, Members views are sought.

#### 4 CAPITAL RESOURCES

- 4.1 Table 2 below shows the forecast position of the movement (i.e. use and new capital receipts) on usable capital receipts for 2010/11 (table 3 shows 2011/12 and table 4 shows 2012/13) which will be used to fund the capital programme.

**Table 2: Impact of the forecast capital programme spend and receipts for 2010/11 on the Useable Capital Receipts Reserve**

USABLE CAPITAL RECEIPTS	Receipts from sale of assets	Cremat'm sinking fund	Preserved right to buy sales	Residual Right to buy	VAT sharing receipt	TOTAL
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Forecast <b>Opening balance</b> at 1 April 2010	(572,618)	(168,550)	(628,685)	(1,349,385)	(1,509,662)	<b>(4,228,900)</b>
Forecast draw down to fund draft 10/11 capital programme	1,564,015	168,550	628,685			<b>2,361,250</b>
Forecast Capital Receipts in year	(1,571,500)					<b>(1,571,500)</b>
Forecast useable Capital Receipts <b>closing balance</b> at 31 March 2011	<b>(580,103)</b>	-	-	<b>(1,349,385)</b>	<b>(1,509,662)</b>	<b>(3,439,150)</b>

- 4.2 As can be demonstrated in Table 2, the Preserved Rights to Buy Sales (post stock transfer), will be exhausted part way through 2010/11, with the remaining £68k of the proposed housing programme for that year and £696k for each of the subsequent 2 years of the proposed programme (£1,410k less forecast external funding of £714k less £628k in reserve), currently being shown as funded from receipts from sale of assets – which

traditionally has been the only source of internal funding for the non-housing programme.

- 4.3 RPWG are asked to note that the forecast drawn down figure £1,564,015 in table 2 above includes £68k to fund the housing capital programme.

**Table 3: Impact of the forecast capital programme spend and receipts for 2011/12 on the Useable Capital Receipts Reserve**

<b>USABLE CAPITAL RECEIPTS</b>	<b>Receipts from sale of assets</b>	<b>Cremat'm sinking fund</b>	<b>Preserved right to buy sales</b>	<b>Residual Right to buy</b>	<b>VAT sharing receipt</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Forecast <b>Opening balance</b> at 1 April 2011	(580,103)	-	-	(1,349,385)	(1,509,662)	<b>(3,439,150)</b>
Forecast draw down to fund draft 10/11 capital programme	1,327,950					<b>1,327,950</b>
Forecast Capital Receipts in year	(2,295,000)					<b>(2,295,000)</b>
Forecast useable Capital Receipts <b>closing balance</b> at 31 March 2012	<b>(1,547,153)</b>	-	-	<b>(1,349,385)</b>	<b>(1,509,662)</b>	<b>(4,406,200)</b>

- 4.4 RPWG are asked to note that the forecast drawn down figure £1,327,950 in table 3 above includes £696k to fund the housing capital programme.

**Table 4: Impact of the forecast capital programme spend and receipts for 2012/13 on the Useable Capital Receipts Reserve**

<b>USABLE CAPITAL RECEIPTS</b>	<b>Receipts from sale of assets</b>	<b>Cremat'm sinking fund</b>	<b>Preserved right to buy sales</b>	<b>Residual Right to buy</b>	<b>VAT sharing receipt</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Forecast <b>Opening balance</b> at 1 April 2012	(1,547,153)	-	-	(1,349,385)	(1,509,662)	<b>(4,406,200)</b>
Forecast draw down to fund draft 10/11 capital programme	1,027,800					<b>1,027,800</b>
Forecast Capital Receipts in year	(3,730,000)					<b>(3,730,000)</b>
Forecast useable Capital Receipts <b>closing balance</b> at 31 March 2013	<b>(4,249,353)</b>	-	-	<b>(1,349,385)</b>	<b>(1,509,662)</b>	<b>(7,108,400)</b>

- 4.5 RPWG are asked to note that the forecast drawn down figure £1,027,800 in table 4 above includes £696k to fund the housing capital programme.

- 4.6 There are two remaining reserves – Residual Right to Buy (current balance of £1,349k) and VAT sharing receipt (current balance of £1,509k), but their purpose is unclear. The housing capital programme does not assume these two reserves are used to support housing expenditure. However, they are available. In the absence of a clear historical committee minute RPWG is asked to consider this assumption with a view to making a recommendation to Executive. The Head of Development Strategy will table a report detailing implications of this decision to the meeting.
- 4.7 The timing of capital receipts is critical to the funding of the proposed Capital programme. The draft capital programme indicates a drawdown of capital reserves over the three year period of £4,717,000. The forecast opening balance at the beginning of the period is £4,228,900, i.e. less than the requirement. The sale of assets, is therefore is essential to funding the capital programme, without the need for borrowing (and needing to service it's finance costs from revenue).
- 4.8 Members are reminded that the receipts detailed in tables 2-4 above are the best forecast prediction as of November 2009. The assets (predominantly land) will be placed on the market when conditions are favourable and this is kept under constant review by the Contracts and Property Manager and Capita DBS. It may be the case that some assets will be placed on the market sooner than currently anticipated, with resulting receipts ahead of those detailed in tables 2-4 above. It is not anticipated as at November 2009, that the assets will be offered for sale at later dates, however if this were to happen, the funding of the capital programme would need to be re-examined.

## **5 PROJECT AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 5.1 It is imperative that the draft capital programme is considered at this early stage to ensure that adequate financing is in place before the 2010/11 programme commences. Once commenced, all budgets will be monitored monthly, with exceptions reported through Corporate Team and Executive quarterly so that management action can be taken to ensure the effective use of resources as planned by the Council.
- 5.2 The capital programme assumes funding from the sale of assets and external (grant) contributions. There is no assumption at this stage to borrow to finance the programme. Generation of capital receipts presents risks in terms of the timing and value of receipt. Capita DBS and the Contracts and Property Manager meet monthly and review asset sales.

- 5.3 The (revised) Council Asset Management Plan will be presented to Executive before January and this will contain expectations of planned sales, and will be reflected in the capital programme presented to Executive in February 2010.
- 5.4 The report makes specific reference to the unknown possible requirement for internal capital funding that may arise in connection with two ongoing projects: Albion Square and Pow Beck. Although it is anticipated that any future spend will be wholly or majority funded externally, there remains the risk that contributions may be required and these are not factored into the current proposed programme or funding requirements.
- 5.5 The value of DCLG receipt, which along with Disabled Facility grant provides external funding for the housing programme, (£504k) has been estimated for 2010/11, at the average of best and worst case expectations, as the DCLG will not be made public until March 2010. The value of receipt has been duplicated for years 2011/12 and 2012/13. The Disabled facility grant has been anticipated as current year receipt (£210k) for the three years, although a bid for £510,000 has been submitted for the Disabled Facilities Grant. If the actual grant receipt fluctuates from these estimates, this will impact on the use of the Useable Capital Reserve as detailed in tables 2-4.
- 5.6 A report will be presented to Executive by the Strategic Housing Manager in April 2010, once the DCLG (single housing pot) grant is confirmed, setting out the implications for the housing capital programme as appropriate.

## **6 IMPACT ON CORPORATE PLAN**

- 6.1 The proposed bids have been summarised under the Corporate key objectives as detailed in Appendix B:

### **List of Appendices:**

Appendix A - Draft capital programme 2010/11-2012/13

Appendix B – Meeting key objectives

Appendices 1-11 – NEW Capital bids

Appendices 15,16(16 & 17 no monetary change)- EXISTING capital bids that require amendment.

**List of Background Documents:** None



**Consultees:**

Head of Service and Service Managers

Deputy S151 Officer – Alison Clark

Contracts and Property Manager – Chris Lloyd

Strategic Housing Manager – Laurie Priebe

DRAFT CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET 10/11, 11/12, 12/13

capital bid number		Expenditure				Funding					2011/12				2012/13				OVERALL TOTAL 10/11-12/13 £'000	Manager
		Existing programme Feb 09 Council £'000	Slippage £'000 aproval sought Exec Nov 09/Feb 10	2010/11 Draft bids submitted Oct/Nov 09 £'000	TOTAL 10/11 including slippage	UCRR	Crem sinking fund	WNF	Preserved Rights To Buy Sales (post stock transfer)	External	Existing programme Feb 09 Council £'000	Slippage £'000 aproval sought Exec Nov 09	Draft bids submitted Oct 09 £'000	TOTAL 11/12 including slippage	Existing programme Feb 09 Council £'000	Slippage £'000 aproval sought Exec Nov 09	Draft bids submitted Oct 09 £'000	TOTAL 12/13 including slippage		
OTHER (CORPORATE)																				
Corporate Department:																			-	
18	Management Information Systems																		-	
	Revenues and Benefits	-	-	215,000	215,000	215,000													215,000	
20	New Financial Mgmt System		15,000		15,000	15,000					15,000		15,000						30,000	
27	New CRM	-	35,000	-	35,000	35,000								-					35,000	
7	Regeneration Software licence			80,000	80,000	80,000								-					80,000	
8	Virtualisation of Servers			30,000	30,000	30,000								-					30,000	
9	Corporate Firewall																			
26	Waste Route Optimisation using GIS	-	32,500		32,500	32,500								-					32,500	
Management Information Systems - Total		-	82,500	325,000	407,500	407,500	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	422,500	
	Public Buildings																		-	
24	Phoenix court phase 2 (retention only)		18,975		18,975					18,975									-	
19	Public Buildings Condition Survey Backlog	241,020		8,980	250,000	250,000					194,670		5,330	200,000			217,000	217,000	667,000	
21	Energy Efficiency Measures	53,000		(200)	52,800	52,800					53,000		(200)	52,800			52,800	52,800	158,400	
16	Land purchase for Millom Cemetery Extension	5,000			5,000	5,000					140,000			140,000					145,000	
Public Buildings - Total		299,020	18,975	8,780	326,775	307,800	-	-	-	18,975	387,670	-	5,130	392,800	-	-	269,800	269,800	989,375	
	Property																		-	
15	New cremators, Distington Crematorium	470,850			470,850	250,300	168,550			52,000	13,150			13,150					484,000	
14	Pow Beck Valley stadium project			150,000		150,000														
10	Copeland reception																			
17	Surveys Cleansing Repairs Adopt Drains	70,000	-		70,000	70,000					173,000			173,000					243,000	
Property - Total		540,850	-	150,000	690,850	470,300	168,550	-	-	52,000	186,150	-	-	186,150	-	-	-	-	877,000	
	Leisure & Environmental Services																		-	
25	Cemeteries and Children's Play Areas H&S Condition Report	44,100			44,100	44,100													44,100	
1	Rottington Beck			90,000	90,000	90,000													90,000	
1	hand vibrator plant			7,000	7,000	7,000													7,000	
3	Play Builder Money 2010	-		90,000	90,000					90,000				-					90,000	
4	Fleet communications/GPS tracking			20,000	20,000	14,000				6,000									20,000	
5	Christmas Lights			62,000	62,000	62,000													62,000	
6	Whitehaven Market Lighting			32,000	32,000	32,000													32,000	
12	Milom swimming pool				-									-					-	
Leisure & Environmental Services - Total		44,100	-	301,000	345,100	249,100	-	-	-	96,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	345,100	
	Regeneration																		-	
13	Albion Square Phase 2	-	-		-														-	
22	Mosaic	6,195			6,195			6,195				6,195		6,195					12,390	
Regeneration - Total		6,195	-	-	6,195	-	-	6,195	-	-	-	-	6,195	6,195	-	-	-	-	12,390	
23	CONTRIBUTION TO WCDF			62,000	62,000	62,000							62,000	62,000			62,000	62,000	186,000	
																			-	
TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME - OTHER		890,165	101,475	846,780	1,838,420	1,496,700	168,550	6,195	-	166,975	573,820	15,000	73,325	662,145	-	-	331,800	331,800	2,832,365	

capital bid number		2010/11		2010/11							2011/12				2012/13				OVERALL TOTAL 10/11-12/13 £'000	Manager
		Existing programme Feb 09 Council £'000	Slippage £'000 aproval sought Exec Nov 09	2010/11 Draft bids submitted Oct 09 £'000	TOTAL 10/11 including slippage						Existing programme Feb 09 Council £'000	Slippage £'000 aproval sought Exec Nov 09	Draft bids submitted Oct 09 £'000	TOTAL 11/12 including slippage	Existing programme Feb 09 Council £'000	Slippage £'000 aproval sought Exec Nov 09	Draft bids submitted Oct 09 £'000	TOTAL 11/12 including slippage		
	HOUSING																			
11	Grants & Financial Assistance & Empty Properties:																			
	Home Repair Assistance	} 504,000	} 696,000	-					TBC	} 1,200,000	1,200,000	TBC	} 1,200,000						L Priebe	
	Renovation Grants			-																
	Renewal Grants			-																
	Empty Properties			-	67,315		628,685												L Priebe	
	Disabled Facilities Grants	210,000		210,000				210,000	TBC			210,000			210,000			L Priebe		
		714,000		696,000	1,410,000	67,315		628,685	714,000			1,410,000	1,410,000	-		1,410,000	1,410,000			
TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME - HOUSING		714,000	-	696,000	1,410,000	67,315	-	-	628,685	714,000	-	-	1,410,000	1,410,000			1,410,000	1,410,000	4,230,000	

TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME EXPENDITURE	1,604,165	101,475	1,542,780	3,248,420	1,564,015	168,550	6,195	628,685	880,975	573,820	15,000	1,483,325	2,072,145	-		1,741,800	1,741,800	7,062,365		
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---------	-------	---------	---------	---------	--------	-----------	-----------	---	--	-----------	-----------	-----------	--	--

Total New Annual Programme				3,248,420									2,072,145			1,741,800		7,062,365		
----------------------------	--	--	--	-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------	--	--	-----------	--	-----------	--	--

Funding summary	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Total
UCRR	1,564,015	1,327,950	1,027,800	3,919,765
Crem sinking fund	168,550			168,550
WNF	6,195	6,195	-	12,390
Preserved Rights to Buy	628,685			628,685
External Funding	880,975	738,000	714,000	2,332,975
	3,248,420	2,072,145	1,741,800	7,062,365

	New bids
	Existing bids (amended)
	Existing bids (unchanged)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
	Rottington Beck	Hand vibrator plant	Play Builder Money 2010	Fleet communications/GPS tracking	Christmas lights	Whitehaven Market lighting	Regeneration Software licence	Virtualisation of servers	Corporate firewall	Reception Copeland Centre	Private sector housing renewal	Millom swimming pool	Albion Square phase 2	Pow Beck Valley stadium project	New cremators, Distington Crematorium	Land purchase for Millom cemetery extension	Surveys cleansing repairs adopt drains	Revenues and Benefits	Public buildings back log	New financial management system	Energy efficiency measures	Mosiac	Contribution to WCDF	Phoenix retention	H&S cemeteries and play areas	Waste route optimisation using GIS	New CRM
Meeting key priorities?																											
1.1 Leading local change																											
1.2 Providing clear direction																											
1.3 Strong strategic partnerships																											
2.2 Regenerating Copeland																											
2.5 Customer focussed																											
2.6 Effective performance management and culture																											
2.7 Strong financial asset management																											
3.2 Safer Copeland																											
3.3 Quality living environment																											
3.4 Sustainability																											
3.5 Quality housing																											
3.6 Leisure and culture																											
3.7 Improving health																											
To fulfill statutory duties?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes/No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Matched funding as % of bid	Nil	Nil	100%	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	②	①				23%	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	100%	Nil	Nil	Nil
Revenue savings achievable?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No*	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Existing policy commitment?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

\* has revenue costs

① Private Sector Housing Renewal - Best estimates for DCLG receipt are £504k, actual award will be confirmed in March 2010. This external funding has been applied first to meeting our statutory duty with regard to Disabled Facilities Grant for which the anticipated demand for 2010/11 is £850k. This leaves £nil to support the Housing Renewal programme which necessitates the majority of the bid put forward (£560 of £696 - the remaining £136k is needed to meet the anticipated DFG demand)

Total anticipated demand on Disabled Facilities Grant	850,000
To be funded:	
Anticipated DFG based on previous two years receipt	-210,000
Use of DCLG anticipated award (this exhausts grant and leaves £nil available to fund Housing renewal programme)	-504,000
Need for Copeland funding (part of bid of £696)	-136,000
	<b>-850,000</b>

Remainder of Copeland funding (part of bid of £696) to be utilised on Housing Renewal Policy **560,000**

② The Reception at Copeland Centre scheme is not sufficiently developed at this time to enable external funding to be secured but negotiations have been entered into with CCC

③ Although not statutory, if the firewall upgrade is not implemented then Copeland will not be fully COCO compliant (version 4.2) and as a result, risks disconnection from DWP links and would render us unable to process revenues

ilities Grants

s and benefits.

Appendix 1 - Rottington Beck

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	David Bechelli
<b>Designation:</b>	Flood & Coastal Defence Engineer
<b>Project Title</b>	St. Bees Promenade Life Extension
<b>Location</b>	St. Bees
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	Construct a new concrete face to the sheet piling with an integral channel for Rottington Beck.
<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	2.5 Customer focussed 3.2 Safer Copeland 3.3 Quality living environment 3.6 Leisure and culture 3.7 Improving health
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	
Financial and Human Resource Implications	Environmental Health do not have the financial or human resources for this project.
Project and risk management	This project will be professionally managed by external project management.
<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	Inspections have revealed deterioration of sheet piling due to corrosion, with perforation in places. Structural engineers assessment effectively state the sheet piling is life expired. This scheme was reported to Executive at it's meeting of 20 October 2009.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	A temporary diversion of Rottington Beck is required, whilst the concrete facing is put in place.
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	Structural engineers report states that there could be a partial failure of the sea wall is as little as 2 to 10 years time.
<b>Key Objectives</b>	Maintain Copeland Borough Council assets for a minimum of 50 years. This supports the Shoreline Management Plan timescales.

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	90,000	0	0	90,000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	90,000	0	0	90,000
External (name where from):				
				0
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	0	0	0	0

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.	0	90,000			90,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	0	90,000	0	0	90,000

<b>Signature:</b>	Dave Bechelli
<b>Date:</b>	28-Oct-09

Appendix 2 - Hand vibrator plant

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Toni Magean
<b>Designation:</b>	Open Spaces Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Hand Arm Vibration Syndrome Monitoring Equipment
<b>Location</b>	Open Spaces Services - Moresby Depot
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	Purchase H&S Vibration Testing Equipment (works out at £15 per staff employee over its 10 year life)

<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	Open Spaces Services support a number of the corporate priorities through improving the quality of the environment and peoples lives 3.2 Safer Copeland
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	Supports Quality of Life objectives
Financial and Human Resource Implications	Capital funding required to purchase H&S Monitoring equipment, its future maintenance will be funded under existing service revenue budgets
Project and risk management	None - will purchase equipment in one transaction

<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	The service currently use manufacturer's vibration figures to monitor and assess the amount of vibration our operators are allowed to be exposed to whilst using plant/equipment. The manufacturer's figures relate to new machines and not those in the working environment.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Provision of H&S test equipment, will allow to test all equipment on a regular basis, as the machines deteriorate with age and in the working environment, this would allow us to re-evaluate staff daily exposure levels
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	If Copeland do not introduce a more accurate assessment for vibration levels on our machinery, there is a high risk of exposing our staff to vibration level above the recommended exposure limits. This could result in Hand Arm Vibration Syndrome which may lead to operatives no longer being able to carry out their duties and the strong possibility of litigation (HAVS condition is irreversible)

<b>Key Objectives</b>	To ensure staff are monitored and protected against Hand Arm Vibration Syndrome (works out at £15 per staff employee over its 10 year life)
-----------------------	---

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	7,000			7,000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	7,000			7,000
External (name where from):	(works out at £15 per staff employee over its 10 year life)			
				0
				0
				0

Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	Contained within Existing Budgets
---	-----------------------------------

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.	7,000				7,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	7,000	0	0	0	7,000

<b>Signature:</b>	T Magean
<b>Date:</b>	10-Oct-09

Appendix 3 - Playbuilder 2010

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Toni Magean
<b>Designation:</b>	Open Spaces Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Up grading of play area stock
<b>Location</b>	To be confirmed (various play sites under consideration)
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	To up grade two play areas using phase 2 of the Playbuilder money approximately £90,000 in accordance with Play England criteria.
<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<p>Links:</p> <p>1.3 Strong strategic partnerships  2.2 Regenerating Copeland  2.5 Customer focussed  3.3 Quality living environment  3.6 Leisure and culture  3.7 Improving health  Will provide a safe, clean environment for children and young people to engage in play and physical activities.</p>
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	Planning Policy Guidance Note 17, Children's Outdoor Play & Teen Spaces Strategy for Copeland, Copeland Play Strategy 2007-2012,
Financial and Human Resource Implications	The installation of the play areas will not place a financial burden on the Council, with 100% funding from the Playbuilder Fund to pay for the up grading of these plays areas in question which are already in Council ownership.
Project and risk management	The project is funded by an external source and will be used to fund local town and parish or community play initiatives subject to meeting the playbuilder funding criteria and evaluation procedure which includes risk management
<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	Much of the Council existing play stock has been in situ, for over twenty years and requires up grading. To ensure the equipment continues to appeal to the young people of the Borough and remains in a safe and useable condition.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Copeland Borough Council, will work with the Parish Council's to up grade or install two new play areas in the Borough using phase 2 of the Playbuilder fund.
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	The Council will be forced to spend increasing amounts of money on maintaining its ageing play equipment or close down play areas at the end of their useful life expectancy. Also the provision of play areas in rural areas within the borough will remain less than adequate.
<b>Key Objectives</b>	Up grade the Council's existing play areas to ensure they do not go into decline and remain interesting to young people.

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	<b>90,000</b>			<b>90,000</b>
Financing:				
CBC Capital				0
External (name where from):				
Playbuilder Fund	90,000			90,000
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	0	0	0	0

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.	45,000	45,000			90,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	45,000	45,000	0	0	90,000

**Signature:** Russell Maddam

**Date:** 26-Oct-09

Appendix 4 - Fleet Communications /GPS Tracking

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL  
2010/11 BUDGET  
CAPITAL BID FORM -

Manager:	Janice Carrol
Designation:	Waste Services Manager
Project Title	Fleet Communications/GPS tracking
Location	Moresby Parks - but able to extend across entire council by purchasing 'add ons'. This bid is for Leisure and Environment ONLY

Project Appraisal Outline	<p>The project is to support the purchase of a single dedicated fleet communications system that would have vehicle tracking capabilities. The current fleet contract requires Translinc (the council's fleet provider) to provide such a system in large vehicles such as refuse vehicles and sweepers but not in the light commercial vehicles. Translinc are currently looking at a system that can have a fixed (hands free phone system) set for vehicles that a driver is with on a constant basis or a portable one where the driver can be away from the vehicle. It is vital that communications are maintained with staff at all times both for service delivery and for health and safety of our staff. Copeland are looking to purchase tracking devices for own (L&amp;E) vehicles/personnel at an estimated cost of £14k at the same time that Translinc purchase tracking equipment for installation in their own vehicles (to meet the current fleet contract conditions). The trackers purchased with CBC's contribution, would remain our asset the trackers purchased by Translinc would remain theirs. Purchasing with them would allow Copeland</p>
---------------------------	--

Strategic Objective:	Links:
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	2.5 Customer focussed Quality living environment 3.3
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	Supports the aim to reduce the Council's carbon footprint by reducing unnecessary mileage and fuel consumption.
Financial and Human Resource Implications	Apart from training on the new system which will be managed within normal hours, within existing revenue budgets, there are no implications.
Project and risk management	The project will be managed by Translinc with support from the L&ES Management team.

Scheme Details:	
Background (why?)	There is currently no single communications system within L&ES and a number of vehicles are deployed with single drivers and mobile phones. This practice is not conducive to discouraging unsafe and illegal practices of using mobile phones whilst driving. In addition the equipment in larger vehicles is some 7 to 8 years old which means the hardware is outdated and difficult to repair. There are ongoing problems with the existing kit which works sporadically and is in desperate need of updating. GPS tracking has proven successful in defending a number of insurance claims and should be considered as necessary for the entire fleet. Service managers within waste collection currently interrogate the data available from the current system (only fitted in large vehicles which are Translinc's assets), if all vehicles were fitted with the system this would allow the checking of each vehicle (30 in total) to be checked on a rolling basis to ensure that each vehicle was checked an average of 6 times a year. This would allow trend data to be collated and acted upon for the benefit of the service (and possibly financially)
Description (how to be undertaken?)	The system will be purchased by Translinc though detailed discussions have yet to take place.
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	Poor communications between management and crews and in turn between Copeland Direct and Waste management, which reduces the services ability to respond to service requests such as missed collection. INSURANCE CLAIMS

Key Objectives	Improved communications leading to personnel security and more responsive services with reduction in unnecessary journeys, which will contribute to the reduction in carbon monitor. It is anticipated that overtime it may be possible to reduce mileage and fuel costs as a result of acting upon information supplied - although any revenue savings cannot at this stage be quantified.
----------------	---

Financial Implications of Project

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
TOTAL Project Cost	20,000			20,000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	14,000			14,000
External (name where from):				
Translinc	6,000			6,000
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	No additional - monthly charge to replace current line charge			

Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage.

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011	Total
	£	£	£	£	£
a.	20,000				20,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	20,000	0	0	0	20,000

Signature:	Janice Carrol
Date:	24-Nov-09



**Appendix 5 - Christmas lighting  
report to meeting on other options**

**COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**2010/11 BUDGET**

**CAPITAL BID FORM -**

<b>Manager:</b>	Toni Magean
<b>Designation:</b>	Open Spaces Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Purchase of Christmas Lighting
<b>Location</b>	Whitehaven, Egremont, Cleator Moor and Millom town centres
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	To purchase festive lighting features and bulbs with low voltage equivalents which will result in lower energy bills and reduce carbon footprint, whilst also giving a much needed boost to the displays. Much of the existing equipment has reached the end of it's life and has been repeatedly repaired and refurbished.

<b>Strategic Objective:</b> Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	<b>Links:</b> 2.2 Regenerating Copeland 2.5 Customer focussed 3.3 Quality living environment 3.6 Leisure and culture
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	
Financial and Human Resource Implications	None - one off purchases of features and bulbs
Project and risk management	None - one off purchases of features and bulbs

<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	The existing equipment has been continually repaired and is not very reliable. Recent improvements in the technology mean that much more efficient light fittings are now available that tend to be much brighter, more durable and last considerably longer.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Most of the cross street features and wall or post mounted features would be replaced with new items. A supply of sufficient LED bulbs (normally 1W) would be purchased to replace the ordinary 15W bulbs we restock with every year. (Companies could be invited to tender to meet our requirements.)
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	We would continue to consume more electricity than necessary to provide festive lighting displays and be subjected to criticism because of unreliable equipment.

<b>Key Objectives</b>	To provide festive lighting in Whitehaven, Egremont, Cleator Moor and Millom, that is reliable and reduces our power consumption (and costs) and our carbon footprint
-----------------------	---

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	62,000			62,000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	62,000			62,000
External (name where from):				
				0
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)				
SAVING	-5,730	-5,730	-5,730	-17,190

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.	62,000				62,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	62,000	0	0	0	62,000

<b>Signature:</b>	Dave Toner
<b>Date:</b>	17/11/2009

**Appendix 6 - Whitehaven market Lighting  
report to meeting**

**COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**2010/11 BUDGET**

**CAPITAL BID FORM -**

<b>Manager:</b>	Toni Magean
<b>Designation:</b>	Open Spaces Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Whitehaven Market Place Lighting
<b>Location</b>	Market Place and James Street
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	Installation of period style lighting
<b>Strategic Objective:</b> Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	<b>Links:</b> 2.2 Regenerating Copeland 2.5 Customer focussed 3.2 Safer Copeland 3.3 Quality living environment
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	
Financial and Human Resource Implications	The contractors and United Utilities will be project managed within the existing resource
Project and risk management	None - Existing relationship with contractors and United Utilities
<b>Scheme Details:</b> Background (why?)	The existing lamp posts are not working and do not have access doors to enable them to be serviced; and the source of the power supplies to them cannot be traced. If they are to be brought back into use it will be necessary to install individual feeder pillars close to each one, which would add to the "street clutter". However as many of the lantern mountings are also very corroded the lighting contractor has advised that the columns be replaced anyway .
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Removal of existing defunct lighting columns and existing wall features, and installation of 18 wall mounted period style features. The work would be carried out via the Council's lighting contractor and United Utilities. These works would considerably reduce the street clutter in this area of the town
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	The area would continue to be inadequately lit resulting in continued concerns and criticism from businesses and residents.
<b>Key Objectives</b>	To provide safe and function lighting to Market Place and James Street

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	32,000			32,000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	32,000			32,000
External (name where from):				
				0
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)				

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.		32000			32,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	0	32,000	0	0	32,000

**Signature:**

Toni Magean

**Date:**

18/11/2009

Appendix 7 - Regeneration software licence

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Pat Graham
<b>Designation:</b>	Head of Development Operations
<b>Project Title</b>	MIS Licenses
<b>Location</b>	Copeland Centre
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	Project to replace the software, currently used by Development Control, Building Control and Land Charges was approved in November 2008. The installation of the project is almost complete and all three teams will be live before the end of the year. This bid seeks to cover the cost of the five year software licence as support by Executive at that time, and for which payment required from April 2010. This is eligible for capital funding.

<b>Strategic Objective:</b> Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	<b>Links:</b> 2.5 Customer focussed 2.6 Effective performance management and culture. The case for the software and its benefits has been made and accepted, these funds enables us to use it.
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	
Financial and Human Resource Implications	None software licence will be purchased in one transaction from established provider with whom Copeland have established a relationship
Project and risk management	None software licence will be purchased in one transaction from established provider with whom Copeland have established a relationship

<b>Scheme Details:</b> Background (why?)	The agreed budget provisions to support the project licence and maintenance, as previously agreed by the Executive.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Purchase of licence
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	We will not be able to use the system or achieve the benefits to the service and customers and associated efficiencies thereafter
<b>Key Objectives</b>	To able use of new software

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	<b>80,000</b>			<b>80,000</b>
Financing:				
CBC Capital	80,000			80,000
External (name where from):				
				0
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)				

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
5 year software license	80,000				80,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	80,000	0	0	0	80,000

<b>Signature:</b>	E P Graham
<b>Date:</b>	14-Oct-09

Appendix 8 - Virtualisation of servers

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Martin Stroud
<b>Designation:</b>	ICT Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Virtualisation of Servers (initially email)
<b>Location</b>	Copeland Centre
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	Replace 6 year old servers with shared storage and virtualised servers to increase capacity of exchange servers for next 5 years. (Lesser cost of options available).

<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	2.5 Customer focussed
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	2.6 Effective performance management and culture
Financial and Human Resource Implications	communicate reliable and securely across all depts. and with citizens
Project and risk management	Capital required to purchase new server, virtualisation will be carried out by staff internally.
	Project managed in house. The risk of not carrying out this project is the loss of exchange server.

<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	Current exchange servers will begin to run out of space in May 2010 . The alternative to this bid is to buy additional space which would require an upgrade server and associated hardware, the cost of which would be in excess of the proposed project, at a minimum of £40k. Furthermore it would not allow provision for business continuity or disaster recovery to be built in. Physical servers also impact on the power and heating requirements for the computer room, use of blade hosted virtual servers lowers power and cooling requirements.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Deploy network attached storage, create virtual servers on that storage and migrate exchange 2003 to new exchange 2010 servers (virtualised)
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	Both Email Servers will require upgrading to ensure compatibility with new versions of exchange email system, allocated and in use space audits show by May 2010 both emails servers will be using 97% of allocated disk space and will be unable to continue to server as an email server. this will have a serious impact and result in Copeland being unable to communicate by email.

<b>Key Objectives</b>	1) support email system 2) provide business continuity 3) Facilitate re build in event of disaster recovery 4) lower carbon emissions 5) Revenue savings - Aim to virtualise 9 servers by 30th September 2009, when we need to review Microsoft licenses. This will deliver potential part year revenue savings of up to £12k, in 2010/11, with potential full year revenue savings of £23k in 2011/12
-----------------------	--

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	30,000			30,000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	30,000			30,000
External (name where from):				0
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	-12,000	-23,000	-23,000	-58,000

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.	30,000				30,000
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	30,000	0	0	0	30,000

<b>Signature:</b>	Martin Stroud
<b>Date:</b>	26/11/2009

Appendix 9 - Corporate firewall

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Martin Stroud
<b>Designation:</b>	ICT Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Network security
<b>Location</b>	Copeland Centre, Moresby Parks, Millom, and SLLVPN remote access connections
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	To purchase firewall to provide additional network security between all sites , which will be become necessary on upgrade to COCO version 4.2

<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	2.5 customer focussed 2.6 effective performance management and culture
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	communicate reliable and securely across all depts and with citizens
Financial and Human Resource Implications	Capital required to purchase firewall & licence to use for 3 years
Project and risk management	Minimal risk, one of purchase and installation

<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	It is a requirement for COCO compliance when the next version (4.2) is released. We need to comply with this during April 2010.
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Purchase and installation of firewall and purchase of 3 year license to enable use.
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	Whilst the security we use on the links to Moresby and Millom, meet industry standard, it does not meet COCO (version 4.2) standard, and we therefore cannot use those links to transmit any information that is protectively marked as "restricted", should such information be transmitted over those links, Copeland would be in breach of the COCO security policy. Government Connect can respond to breaches of the policy by removing access to the GCSX network, effectively stopping or access to vital DWP information. Deployment of these firewalls will provide further security enhancements for all data transmitted across the 3rd party links and further mitigate any possible loss of data.

<b>Key Objectives</b>	To retain our COCO compliance
-----------------------	-------------------------------

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	<b>17,080</b>			<b>17,080</b>
Financing:				
CBC Capital	17,080			17,080
External (name where from):				
				0
				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	14,000	14,000	14,000	recurrent

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a.	17,080				17,080
b.					0
c.					0
d.					0
e.					0
	17,080	0	0	0	17,080

<b>Signature:</b>	Martin Stroud
<b>Date:</b>	12/11/2009

Appendix 10 - Copeland Centre Reception

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM

<b>Manager:</b>	Chris Lloyd
<b>Designation:</b>	Contracts and Property Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	New reception Counter and alterations The Copeland Centre
<b>Location</b>	Copeland
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	The Council reception was designed some 6 years ago to meet the Councils requirements at that time. Since occupation of the building the way in which customer services was provided has changed substantially, and is continually evolving, including sharing services with Cumbria County Council local links , providing space for other organisations i.e. HMRC, Police, The current layout is inadequate for provision of these services with problems including queuing and confidentiality. Now that current Customer needs are better understood provision of a larger more flexible reception counter is considered to be necessary. provision of a budget for a new reception is likely to require removal of existing partitions in reception, a larger counter, review of use and orientation of interview room, and location of customer services officer to allow a more functional counter to be installed, and to consider entrance doors customer and staff access routes.

<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the six Corporate priorities	1.3 Strong strategic partnerships 2.5 Customer focussed 2.6 Effective performance management and culture 3.2 Safer Copeland
Supports other Corporate Plan priority	
Financial and human resources implications	To be considered further within process.
Project and risk management	As standard procedures

<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	Enable Copeland Borough Council to provide the best possible services to customers. Meet current day expectations of customers. Provide one stop shop for more than just Council services
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Assessment of requirements, scope and extent of services, interpret and include in revised layout, review and put forward proposal. This project could be funded through the Unitary fund over the remaining 20 year term. This would however create a REVENUE PRESSURE for the 20 years of (say 5% interest) £15,000 pa
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	No updating or improvement in customer services.

<b>Key Objectives</b>	Continuance/improvement of Council services, maintain investment property.
-----------------------	--

**Financial Implications of Project**

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £	
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	<b>150,000</b>			150,000	
Financing:					
CBC Capital	150,000			150,000	
External (name where from):					
a. Cumbria County Council TBC	25,000			25,000	This has not been confirmed
b.					
c.					
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	None - or cost could be paid through Unitary Charge as an alternative increasing annual revenue costs over next 20 years. Estimate at £15,000 pa				

**Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage**

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a. Conversion		150,000			
b.					
c.					
d.					
e.					
	0	150,000	0	0	0

<b>Signature:</b>	C A Lloyd
<b>Date:</b>	13 11 2009

## Appendix 11 Private sector housing

## COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

## 2010/11 BUDGET

## CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Laurie Priebe
<b>Designation:</b>	Strategic Housing Services Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Private Housing Sector Renewal
<b>Location</b>	Borough-wide
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	The purpose is to promote the achievement of the Decent Homes Standard in the private housing sector. Also to remove Category 1 hazards under the Housing Health & Safety Rating System introduced by the Housing Act, 2004. Note that this bid is because we expect our allocated grant from DCLG to be reduced. In 2008/09 we received £1.175m, in 2009/2010 we received £842k under the 65% protection. However the Government has warned all local housing authorities to expect a lower grant next year, with the possibility of protection being reduced to just 45% which would result in an award in region of £500k.
<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	2.2 Regenerating Copeland 2.3 Customer focussed 3.3 Quality living environment 3.5 Quality housing
Supports Corporate Improvement Plan	"Promoting Prosperity: bring 60 private sector properties up to a decent standard by April 2010 with the use of home renewal financial assistance." I have not seen a 2010/2011 CIP but we are still about 2.5% below the target in the cell above
Financial and Human Resource Implications	The Home Renewal section of the Housing Services Team is currently fully staffed and is able to deliver home renewal assistance as defined by the financial assistance policy approved by the Council in December 2008 and which came into effect on 1/4/09. We will not know our allocation under the Regional Housing Capital Pot for 2010/2011 until March 2010
Project and risk management	If this bid was not supported, Copeland would fail to meet our corporate housing objectives and leave economically vulnerable households at risk of harm in homes that are not weatherproof, warm or safe.

## Scheme Details:

	Our financial assistance policy is targeted at properties that contain at least one category 1 hazard as defined in the Housing Health & Safety Rating System. The policy is also targeted at older households; economically vulnerable households; families with dependent children; first time buyers of homes in poor condition which have been empty for at least 6 months. Our private sector housing condition survey of 2007 estimated a backlog of £57M to bring the private sector up to the Decent Homes Standard. The demand for renewed private sector housing assistance is high along with residents continuing requirement for disabled facilities grant support. Copeland's strategic approach to bringing empty homes back into use, targeting vulnerable residents to improve their private dwellings to ensure quality of life and decency standards, requires a level of funding in the coming three years, due to the anticipated reduction in our regional housing grant. A six month review of Copeland's new Housing Assistance Policy, which was launched in April 2009 has been undertaken to ensure continued effective targeting to out most vulnerable households and this will be presented to
Description (how to be undertaken?)	The Council's approved financial assistance policy for home renewal is a mix of grants and interest free loans supported by a charge placed on the property which must be repaid when the home is sold. If we do not adequately fund the scheme we will fail to remove category 1 hazards from private sector homes occupied by older and economically vulnerable residents. If the scheme is underfunded we will also fail the government target of achieving 70% compliance with the decent homes standard for economically vulnerable households by 2010
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	If this bid was not supported, Copeland would fail to meet our corporate housing objectives and leave economically vulnerable households at risk of harm in homes that are not weatherproof, warm or safe.
<b>Key Objectives</b>	To ensure private house stock is updated in line with decent home standards and to eliminate category 1 hazards

## Financial Implications of Project

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	<b>approved capital programme is for £1.2m</b>			
Financing:				
CBC Capital	696,000	696,000	696,000	2,088,000
External (name where from):				
estimated from DCLG from regional housing capital pot				0
£500,000 - £842000				0
				0
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)				
None				

## Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a. Please note that it is currently unreliable to estimate the likely spend of an earmarked reserve of £0.5M quarter by quarter.					0
d The purpose of this bid is to protect against the worst case scenario of our allocation for 2010/2011 being reduced to £0.5M					0
c. from £1.175M in 2008/09. The bid is for an earmarked reserve only.					0
d.					0
e.	0	0	0	0	0

## Signature:

## Date:

Laurie Priebe
13/10/2009

Appendix 15 New cremators - increase to approved bid

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

<b>Manager:</b>	Chris Lloyd
<b>Designation:</b>	Contracts and Property Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	NEW CREMATOR
<b>Location</b>	DISTINGTON CREMATORIUM
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	Project for installation of new cremator to replace existing two cremators now having reached the end of their useful life.
<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the 6 corporate priorities	2.5 Customer focussed. 3.4 Sustainability
Supports Corporate Improvement	
Financial and Human Resource	
Project and risk management	Standard processes involved including full life cost assessment, OJEU competitive tendering
<b>Scheme Details:</b>	
Background (why?)	This bid is for funding in addition to that approved by Executive on 25 August 2009. The funding approved on that date was for: Gross cost of project £518,000 external income (Cameo receipts) (£148,000) CBC funding requirement £370,000. The Gross cost of the project is now anticipated to be £526,000 (increase of £8,000) and the external funding has been revised to £118,000 (revision of £30,000) requiring CBC funding of £408,000 to support this project, an <b>increase of £38,000</b>
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Selection of preferred cremator supplier plus building contract to remove existing ,undertake necessary alterations and fit new.
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with evidence)	Excessive maintenance cost of existing regular and increasing breakdowns leading to further reduction in service.
<b>Key Objectives</b>	To enable continuation of service in an efficient manner providing good service to customers.

Financial Implications of additional bid

		2010/11 additional cost £	2011/12 £	Total Project including current year £
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>		<b>8,000</b>		<b>8,000</b>
<b>VAT</b>		<b>1,400</b>		<b>1,400</b>
Financing:				
CBC Capital		<b>38,000</b>		<b>38,000</b>
VAT		<b>1,400</b>		<b>1,400</b>
External (name where from):				
Cameo Income reserve		<b>-30,000</b>		<b>-30,000</b>
Cameo Income receipt in year				
Total external				
VAT				
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)				

£10k per annum from existing budgets (plus VAT)

	£	£	£	£
<b>TOTAL Project Cost</b>	42,000	<b>470,850</b>	<b>13,150</b>	<b>526,000</b>
<b>VAT</b>	7,350	<b>82,399</b>	<b>2,301</b>	<b>92,050</b>
Financing:				
CBC Capital		394,850	13,150	408,000
VAT		<b>69,099</b>	<b>2,301</b>	<b>71,400</b>
External (name where from):				
Cameo Income reserve	10,000	19,950		29,950
Cameo Income receipt in year	32000	32,000	24,000	88,000
Total external	42,000	51,950	24,000	117,950
VAT		9,091	4,200	20,641
Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)		£10k per annum from existing budgets		

£10k per annum from existing budgets (plus VAT)

Projected Detailed Total Expenditure by Quarter - for 2010/11 only at this stage

Item/Type of Expenditure (e.g. Land acquisition, legal fees, project management costs, software licence etc)	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th June 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 30th Sept 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st Dec 2010 £	Projected Total Expenditure by 31st March 2011 £	Total £
a. Project management	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	36,000
b. Construction/new cremator		205,425	229,425		434,850



COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

2010/11 BUDGET

CAPITAL BID FORM -

c. Contract retention (payment  
beyond march 2011)  
d.  
e.

0  
0  
0

	9,000	214,425	238,425	9,000	470,850
VAT	1,575	37,524	41,724	1,575	82,399

Signature:

C A Lloyd

Date:

17 11 09

**COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**2009/10 BUDGET**

**CAPITAL BID FORM**

<b>Manager:</b>	Chris Lloyd
<b>Designation:</b>	Contracts and Property Manager
<b>Project Title</b>	Purchase land for extension of cemetery provision Millom
<b>Location</b>	Copeland
<b>Project Appraisal Outline</b>	<p><b>This bid of £150,000 was approved by Council, in February 2009 for inclusion in the Capital Programme at £5,000 in 2009/10, £5,000 in 2010/11 and £140,000 in 2011/12. It is being highlighted to Members, as since the bid was approved to purchase land the possibility of obtaining land at Millom Park in exchange for maintenance of the park, has arisen.</b></p> <p>The current cemetery provision at Millom will be at its limit within a max. of 4 years (based on current levels of 15 graves per annum). Requirements beyond this are approx 200 graves to cater for a further 20 years. Based on comparisons with Whitehaven cemetery an area of at least 0.6 acres will be required. The Council does not own any further land which could be made available for further provision. At present there is no land available. It will be necessary to purchase additional land and Capita has been appointed to seek available land and report back. As there is a lack of suitable land it will be necessary to consider what can be purchased, potentially to include dwellings</p>
<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Links:</b>
Supports one or more of the six Corporate priorities	2.5 Customer focussed
Supports other Corporate Plan priority	Provision of full life facilities in Copeland

# COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

## 2009/10 BUDGET

### CAPITAL BID FORM

Financial and human resources implications	Enquiries to be made through land management - this budget to support cost.
Project and risk management	As standard procedures

#### Scheme Details:

Background (why?)	To provide sufficient burial space in the borough for residents
Description (how to be undertaken?)	Enquire about land review select purchase subject to check on suitability and planning approvals.
Implications of not undertaking the scheme (with)	Lack of burial space - residents of Borough would have to use facilities outside borough if available.

#### Key Objectives

Efficient accountable council.
--------------------------------

#### Financial Implications of Project

	2010/11 £	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	Total £
Project Cost	5000	140000		145000
Financing:				
CBC Capital	5000	140000		145000
External (name where from):				

Revenue Implications (ensure revenue bid is submitted separately)	Already considered see report 15 11 08
---	--

#### Signature:

*Chris Lloyd*

#### Date:

09 01 2009.