

MEETING: CABINET
DATE: Thursday 16th December, 2010
TIME: 10.00 am
VENUE: Town Hall, Bootle

Member

Councillor

Robertson (Chair)
Booth
Brodie - Browne
P. Dowd
Fairclough
Maher
Moncur
Parry
Porter
Tattersall

COMMITTEE OFFICER: Steve Pearce
Head of Committee and Member Services
Telephone: 0151 934 2046
Fax: 0151 934 2034
E-mail: steve.pearce@sefton.gov.uk

The Cabinet is responsible for making what are known as Key Decisions, which will be notified on the Forward Plan. Items marked with an * on the agenda involve Key Decisions

A key decision, as defined in the Council's Constitution, is: -

- any Executive decision that is not in the Annual Revenue Budget and Capital Programme approved by the Council and which requires a gross budget expenditure, saving or virement of more than £100,000 or more than 2% of a Departmental budget, whichever is the greater
- any Executive decision where the outcome will have a significant impact on a significant number of people living or working in two or more Wards

If you have any special needs that may require arrangements to facilitate your attendance at this meeting, please contact the Committee Officer named above, who will endeavour to assist.

This page is intentionally left blank.

AGENDA

Items marked with an * involve key decisions

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Subject/Author(s)</u> | <u>Wards Affected</u> | |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Apologies for Absence | | |
| 2. | Declarations of Interest Members and Officers are requested to give notice of any personal or prejudicial interest and the nature of that interest, relating to any item on the agenda in accordance with the relevant Code of Conduct. | | |
| 3. | Minutes Minutes of the meeting held on 25 November 2010 | | (Pages 7 - 14) |
| * 4. | Transformation Programme and Further Options Report of the Chief Executive (to follow) | All Wards; | |
| 5. | Sefton City Learning Centres - Capital Redevelopment Funding Report of the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families | All Wards; | (Pages 15 - 20) |
| 6. | Schools Access Initiative - Additional Schemes Report of the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families | Cambridge; Derby; | (Pages 21 - 26) |
| 7. | Sure Start Early Years and Childcare Grant - Quality and Access 2010/11 Report of the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families | All Wards; | (Pages 27 - 30) |
| 8. | Playbuilder Capital Grant 2010/11 Report of the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families | All Wards; | (Pages 31 - 36) |

| | | | |
|-------|--|---|-----------------|
| 9. | Bedford and Queens Road, Bootle - Programme for Demolition and Clearance Phase II - Proposed Extension of Existing Contract Report of the Strategic Director - Communities | Derby; Linacre; | (Pages 37 - 42) |
| 10. | ROK Building Ltd (in Administration) Report of the Environmental and Technical Services Director | Derby; Dukes; Kew; Linacre; Litherland; Norwood; | (Pages 43 - 50) |
| 11. | Bedford Primary School, Bootle - Provision of New Family Room Extension Report of the Environmental and Technical Services Director | Derby; Linacre; | (Pages 51 - 54) |
| * 12. | Thornton Switch Island Link - Best And Final Funding Bid Report of the Planning and Economic Development Director | Manor; Molyneux; Netherton and Orrell; Park; St. Oswald; Sudell; | (Pages 55 - 80) |
| 13. | Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Service (MELS) Report of the Planning and Economic Development Director | All Wards; | (Pages 81 - 90) |
| 14. | Proposals for the Creation of a Single Registration Service for Births, Deaths and Marriages for Sefton Report of the Leisure and Tourism Director | All Wards; | (Pages 91 - 96) |
| 15. | Southport Market Gateway Features (Public Art) - Referral from Southport Area Committee Extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Southport Area Committee held on 17 November 2010 | Dukes; | (Pages 97 - 98) |

16. Exclusion of Press and Public

To consider passing the following resolution:

That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act. The Public Interest Test has been applied and favours exclusion of the information from the Press and Public.

17. Sefton New Directions

Report of the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services

All Wards;

(Pages 99 - 104)

This page is intentionally left blank

THE "CALL IN" PERIOD FOR THIS SET OF MINUTES ENDS AT 12 NOON ON FRIDAY 3 DECEMBER 2010. MINUTE NOS. 148. 150 AND 152 ARE NOT SUBJECT TO "CALL-IN"

CABINET

MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, SOUTHPORT ON THURSDAY 25TH NOVEMBER, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor Robertson (in the Chair)
Councillors Booth, Brodie - Browne, P. Dowd,
Fairclough, Maher, Moncur, Parry, Porter and
Tattersall

144. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

145. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were received:

| Member | Minute No. | Reason | Action |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Councillor Fairclough | 149 – Treasury Management 2010/11 Mid Year Review | Personal – His employer is referred to in the report | Took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon |

146. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 28 October 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

147. SEFTON'S HEALTH 2010

The Cabinet considered the annual report of the Acting Director of Public Health highlighting the health of the local population. The report focussed on the national Strategic Review of Health Inequalities produced by Professor Sir Michael Marmot (February 2010), by providing a framework to focus the efforts on improving health and well-being within Sefton in a sustainable way for the longer term by addressing the following six policy objectives:

- Give every child the best start in life
- Enable all children, young people and adults to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives
- Create fair employment and good work for all
- Ensure a healthy standard of living for all

Agenda Item 3

CABINET- THURSDAY 25TH NOVEMBER, 2010

- Create and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities
- Strengthen the role and impact of ill-health prevention

The report also indicated that despite people living longer and healthier lives, the priorities emerging from Sefton's recently updated Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) highlighted the need to:

- Reduce health inequalities within Sefton, and between Sefton and other areas
- Focus on prevention and early detection of both physical and mental illness
- Reduce the levels of behaviours that carry risk for future health
- Tackle the main diseases from which people die;

and concluded that as preparations were made for the establishment of Health and Well-being Boards, proposed in the NHS White Paper 'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS', there was a need to continue to work in partnership and refocus priorities to ensure that combined resources were reallocated to address the key health needs in Sefton.

Cathy Warlow, Head of Health Improvements and Partnerships, NHS Sefton, gave a presentation on the key issues in the report referred to above.

RESOLVED:

That the Annual Report of the Director of Public Health be noted.

148. TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME AND FURTHER OPTIONS

Further to Minute No. 127 of the meeting held on 28 October 2010, the Cabinet considered the report of the Chief Executive which provided an update on the Transformation Programme and sought approval for further budget options which would reduce the 2011/12 - 2013/14 budget gap. The report also provided an update on the review of externally funded activity and proposals for the cessation of some of that activity.

This was a Key Decision and was included in the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

Prior to the consideration of the savings options set out in Appendices A and B of the report, a vote was taken on a proposal that the consideration of the savings options be deferred until the next Cabinet Meeting on 16 December 2010 and this proposal was lost by 6 votes to 4. The Cabinet then considered the options set out in the two appendices.

RESOLVED: That

CABINET- THURSDAY 25TH NOVEMBER, 2010

- (1) the Council be recommended to give approval to the 100% cessation savings options in respect of externally funded activity totalling £3,483,984, as set out in Appendix A to the report;
- (2) the Council be recommended to give approval to the tactical savings options as set out in Table A of Appendix B to the report;
- (3) the Council be recommended to give approval to the tactical savings options as set out in Table B of Appendix B to the report, with the exception of the following savings options which are deferred for further consideration at the Cabinet Meeting on 16 December 2010, pending the submission of further information by officers on the options:
 - CM7 – Reduce overtime hours for Street Cleansing Service;
 - CE19(a) – Cease membership of the Local Government Association; and
 - CM8 – Stop non-Highway cleaning;
- (4) officers be authorised to prepare for the implementation of the above savings options immediately, pending final decisions of the Council;
- (5) it be noted that further savings proposals will be submitted to the Cabinet Meeting on 16 December 2010; and
- (6) the Chief Executive be requested to speak to the Editor of the Southport Visiter on behalf of the Cabinet, in order to request that journalists do not engage in conversations with anyone present during the course of the meeting, out of respect for the Members engaging in debate.

(In accordance with Rule 18.5 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules, the following Councillors requested that their votes against the following resolutions set out above be recorded, namely:

Resolutions (1), (2) and (3) with the exception of the three savings options deferred for further consideration in (3) – Councillors P. Dowd, Fairclough, Maher and Moncur

Resolution (3) with regard to the deferral of the saving option CE19(a) to cease membership of the Local Government Association – Councillor Parry)

149. TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2010/11 MID YEAR REVIEW

The Cabinet considered the report of the Interim Head of Corporate Finance and ICT Strategy reviewing the Treasury Management activities undertaken in the first half of 2010/11 against the Treasury Management Policy and Strategy document 2010/11.

Agenda Item 3

CABINET- THURSDAY 25TH NOVEMBER, 2010

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

150. STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT PROPERTY INTERVENTION FUND

The Cabinet considered the report of the Strategic Director - Communities on proposals for the inclusion of a Strategic Asset Management Property Intervention provision within the Capital Programme, to be funded from the proceeds of asset disposals, to address ongoing property management issues.

RESOLVED:

That the Council be recommended to give approval to:

- (1) the establishment of a £500,000 Strategic Asset Management Property Intervention provision within the Capital Programme to be funded and maintained from capital receipts derived from asset disposals; and
- (2) the amendment of Part 3 of the Council Constitution (Responsibility for Functions) in order to give the management responsibility for the Strategic Asset Management Property Intervention provision to the Strategic Director - Communities, in conjunction with the Head of Corporate Finance and ICT.

151. PRESFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL - SPECIALIST SCHOOL STATUS

Further to Minute No. 61 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member - Children's Services, held on 16 November 2010, the Cabinet considered the report of the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families seeking approval to the implementation of a scheme to enhance the facilities of Presfield Special School following its designation as a specialist school for Special Education Needs Communication and Interaction with effect from 1 September 2010.

RESOLVED:

That the expenditure for the scheme to be funded from specific resources be included in the Children, School's and Families Services Capital Programme 2010/11.

152. FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT

The Cabinet considered the report of the Environmental and Technical Services Director on the progress made on applications for grant aid funding from the Environment Agency for Flood Risk Management Schemes.

CABINET- THURSDAY 25TH NOVEMBER, 2010

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Council be recommended to give approval to the inclusion of the following schemes in the Capital Programme to be fully funded from ring-fenced Environment Agency grant and a revenue contribution of £20,000 from the Land Drainage Works budget:
 - (i) Claremont Avenue, Maghull Land Drainage investigation - £35,000
 - (ii) Thornton and Lunt Land Drainage Investigation - £39,000
 - (iii) Dobbs Gutter Flood Alleviation Study - £41,000
 - (iv) Surface Water Management Plan - £120,000 (including £20,000 revenue contribution);
- (2) it be noted that a grant application had been submitted to the Environment Agency for the Moss Lane, Lydiate Flood Alleviation Scheme (£245,000) and that this would be the subject of a further report to the Cabinet following the outcome of the bid.

153. PROPOSED NEW POST 16 SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FACILITY, THORNTON

The Cabinet considered the joint report of the Strategic Director - Children, Schools and Families and the Environmental and Technical Services Director on proposals for a negotiated contract to be placed for the works required to provide a New Post 16 Special Educational Needs facility at the site of the former Thornton Primary School, Thornton.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) approval be given to the waiving of the Contract Procedure Rules to enable the appointment of Conlon Construction as the preferred contractors for the project; and
- (2) subject to the total scheme being contained within the £2m funding provision and the receipt of planning approval for the proposed scheme, the Environmental and Technical Services Director be authorised to enter into a formal contract with Conlon Construction for the delivery of the Thornton Special Educational Needs project.

154. PROPOSED CLOSURE OF HOMELESSNESS UNIT - WINDSOR HOUSE, SOUTHPORT

The Cabinet considered the report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director on proposals for the closure of the Homelessness Unit at Windsor House, Manchester Road, Southport, which was one of the two homelessness units for vulnerable families in Sefton.

RESOLVED: That

Agenda Item 3

CABINET- THURSDAY 25TH NOVEMBER, 2010

- (1) approval be given to the closure of the Windsor House Homelessness Unit; and
- (2) the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director be requested to implement an appropriate personnel process in respect of staffing requirements in light of the proposed closure of the Homelessness Unit.

155. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN - ALLOCATION OF CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR 2010/11 AND 2011/12 ONWARDS

Further to Minute No. 105 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member - Technical Services held on 17 November 2010, the Cabinet considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director on the review of capital funding available for the Local Transport Plan Programme.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the resources available from capital contributions to transport schemes and the potential to allocate such resources to support the Local Transport Plan Capital Programme be noted; and
- (2) the sum of £100,000 be allocated to the Local Transport Plan Programme to address longstanding highway parking issues within the Borough and the remaining sum of £287,000 from the uncommitted capital resources be allocated to support the Council's budget savings programme.

156. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2010

Further to Minute No. 103 of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 November 2010, the Cabinet considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director on the progress of the Local Development Framework by the monitoring of a range of indicators.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) approval be given to the submission of the 2010 Annual Monitoring Report to the Government Office for the North West (GONW); and
- (2) the Planning and Economic Development Director be given delegated authority to make editorial changes relating to layout and presentation, the addition of late information and make changes as recommended by GONW prior to submission of the annual Monitoring Report.

157. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN'S ANNUAL LETTER AND REPORT 2009/10

Further to Minute No. 10 of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 18 November 2010, the Cabinet considered the report of the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services which incorporated a copy of the Local Government Ombudsman's Annual Letter and Report detailing the complaints about the Council submitted to the Ombudsman during 2009/10.

RESOLVED:

That the Local Ombudsman's Annual Letter and Report be noted.

158. CABINET MEMBER REPORTS

The Cabinet received reports from the Cabinet Members for Children's Services, Communities, Corporate Services, Environmental, Health and Social Care, Leisure and Tourism, Performance and Governance, Regeneration and Technical Services.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member reports be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member - Children's Services
Cabinet
Council

DATE: 7 December 2010
16 December 2010
16 December 2010

SUBJECT: Sefton City Learning Centres: Capital Redevelopment
Funding

**WARDS
AFFECTED:** All Wards

REPORT OF: Peter Morgan
Strategic Director - Children, Schools & Families

**CONTACT
OFFICER:** Chris Dalziel (0151 934 3337)

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** NO

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the proposed expenditure of this grant.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

The Cabinet Member, Children, Schools & Families, has delegated powers to approve the proposed expenditure and to refer this to Cabinet for inclusion in the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

The Cabinet Member is recommended to:-

- i). approve the proposed expenditure, to be funded entirely from specific resources, and
- ii). refer the expenditure to Cabinet and Council for inclusion in the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

The Cabinet and Council are recommended to approve the proposed expenditure, to be funded entirely from specific resources and include the expenditure with the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

KEY DECISION: No.

Agenda Item 5

FORWARD PLAN: Not appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the expiry of the “call-in” period for the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

Not appropriate.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: None.

Financial: There are no financial implications for the Council’s general capital resources and all proposals will be funded from the City Learning Centres (CLCs) capital grant 2010/11 as detailed below and from the same grant in 2009/10.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | 150,000 | 150,000 | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| CLC Capital Redevelopment Funding | 150,000 | 150,000 | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: None arising from this report.

Risk Assessment: There are no risks associated with this report as all funding is from specific resources.

Asset Management: Not appropriate.

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

FD566 - The Head of Corporate Finance and Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on the report.

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | ✓ | | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | ✓ | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | ✓ | | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | | ✓ | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | ✓ | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | ✓ | | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | ✓ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | ✓ | | |

LINKS TO ENSURING INTEGRATION:

The proposals will contribute towards creating highly effective, inclusive learning environments for all age groups.

IMPACT UPON CHILDREN, SCHOOLS & FAMILIES TARGETS AND PRIORITIES:

The proposals will have a positive impact on the following targets:-

- Educational achievement and training;
- Making a positive contribution;
- Statutory education targets;

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Report to Cabinet Member and Cabinet – 4/20 May 2010: Sefton CLC: Capital Redevelopment Funding.

Agenda Item 5

SEFTON CITY LEARNING CENTRES: CAPITAL REDEVELOPMENT FUNDING

1. Background

- 1.1 Members will recall that Sefton MBC was allocated a Capital Redevelopment Grant of £300,000 in 2009/10 and again in 2010/11 to allow for the continued development of the two City Learning Centres (CLCs) based at Ainsdale Hope CE High School and Savio Salesian College.
- 1.2 Although a report in May 2010 detailed proposed expenditure of the 2009/10 allocation this was never fully actioned due to the uncertain future of the CLCs which will cease to function in December 2010. A total of £261,081 from the 2009/10 allocation remains unspent.
- 1.3 Representations were made to Partnerships for Schools (PfS) to request that this funding be carried forward into the current financial year and a response to this request was received on 24 November 2010. PfS have confirmed that the £261,081 can be carried forward into 2010/11 but must be expended by 31 March 2011. The total funding available in 2010/11 is therefore £561,081.
- 1.4 The 2010/11 capital redevelopment grant of £300,000 was released to the local authority by Becta (British Education, Communication, Technology Agency) following submission and approval of an Annual Performance Agreement (APA), which detailed the local priorities for supporting the use of technology in teaching and learning.
- 1.5 The Annual Performance Agreement (APA) focussed on the effective use of technology to promote equality, aspiration, motivation and achievement through enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in a range of settings and in response to the Every Child Matters agenda.
- 1.6 The CLC capital redevelopment grant is limited to structural changes to the building, computer hardware and related software and training bought as a single package and software, including upgrades, (but not subscriptions). It must not be used to pay for consumables, staffing or other non-CLC purposes. In addition, this money must not be shared out amongst partner schools. The 2010/11 funding, which is ring-fenced must be expended by 31 August 2011.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 Following dialogue with Becta, it is agreed that the local authority can spend CLC capital redevelopment funding on portable or semi-portable ICT equipment which is used to support outreach work in schools but not to provide static equipment or infrastructure upgrades for the school which could not conceivably be returned to the local authority at some future

Agenda Item 5

date. Ownership of this hardware or software would remain with the Local Authority and not the target schools.

- 2.2 It is proposed that the CLC Capital Redevelopment funding is used to purchase a range of innovative ICT equipment that can be used to support schools in transforming teaching and learning across all national curriculum stages.
- 2.3 It is anticipated that the proposed investment will encourage wider access and use of technology for Sefton schools delivering Foundation Stage, Primary and Secondary curriculum and Further Education.
- 2.4 The Local Authority will engage with schools through SASH (Sefton Association of Secondary Heads) and SAPH (Sefton Association of Primary Heads) groups to agree an appropriate portfolio of ICT equipment that will support all schools to improve their use of technology.
- 2.5 The Local Authority will also engage with schools through SASH (Sefton Association of Secondary Heads) and SAPH (Sefton Association of Primary Heads) groups to agree a mechanism for allocation of ICT equipment.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Cabinet Member is recommended to:-
 - i). approve the proposed expenditure, to be funded entirely from specific resources, and
 - ii). refer the expenditure to Cabinet for inclusion in the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

The Cabinet and Council are recommended to approve the proposed expenditure, to be funded entirely from specific resources and include the expenditure with the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member, Children's Services
Cabinet

DATE: 7 December 2010
16 December 2010

SUBJECT: Schools Access Initiative - Additional Schemes

**WARDS
AFFECTED:** Derby And Cambridge Wards

REPORT OF: Peter Morgan
Strategic Director - Children, Schools & Families

**CONTACT
OFFICER:** Chris Dalziel (0151 934 3337)

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** NO

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the proposed schemes to be funded from the Schools Access Initiative Capital Allocation.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

The Cabinet Member, Children, Schools & Families has delegated powers to approve the proposed schemes and to refer them to Cabinet for inclusion in the 2010/11 Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

The Cabinet Member, Children, Schools & Families is recommended to:-

- i). approve the proposed schemes detailed in this report;
- ii). refer the funding to Cabinet for inclusion in the 2010/11 Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme.

KEY DECISION: No.

FORWARD PLAN: Not appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the expiry of the "call-in" period for the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting.

Agenda Item 6

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

Not appropriate.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: None.

Financial: There are no financial implications for the Council's general resources as all funding is from specific resources (Schools Access Initiative allocation 2010/11). The total cost of the schemes detailed in this report is estimated at £17,000 which, if approved, will leave a balance of £38,946 to support further schemes.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: Not appropriate.

Risk Assessment: There are no financial risks associated with this report as all funding is from specific resources.

Asset Management: The proposed allocation of funding is in line with the Children, Schools & Families Asset Management Plan.

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

FD 555 - The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on this report.

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | ✓ | | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | ✓ | | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | ✓ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | | ✓ | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | ✓ | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | ✓ | | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | ✓ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | ✓ | | |

LINKS TO ENSURING INTEGRATION:

The proposed schemes will contribute towards the inclusion agenda by improving access for pupils with physical disabilities and/or mobility problems.

IMPACT UPON CHILDREN, SCHOOLS & FAMILIES TARGETS AND PRIORITIES:

The proposed scheme will have a positive impact on the following LAA targets.

- ❖ Educational achievement and training.
- ❖ The health of children and young people.
- ❖ Changing perceptions.
- ❖ Statutory Education Targets.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Report to Cabinet – 2 September 2010 – Capital Programme Review

Agenda Item 6

SCHOOLS ACCESS INITIATIVE: ADDITIONAL SCHEMES

1. Background

- 1.1 Sefton MBC has received a Schools Access Initiative (SAI) capital allocation in 2010/11 of £400,790. Taking into account schemes already approved there remains a balance of £90,277.
- 1.2 The SAI funding provides support for capital projects to improve access to education in schools for pupils with disabilities and special educational needs.
- 1.3 Cabinet confirmed, on 2 September 2010, that schemes funded from uncommitted SAI capital could be progressed.

2. Proposed Scheme

- 2.1 Stanley High School is one of Sefton's secondary schools that is designated for pupils with physical disabilities or mobility problems and serves the Southport area of the Borough.
- 2.2 All areas of the school are accessible to pupils in wheelchairs with the exception of the stage within the main hall. Pupils with physical disabilities cannot access the stage during drama or for presentations and award events. The proposal is to provide a mobile lifting device which will allow access from the rear of the stage when required. The cost of the device is £8,000.
- 2.3 A second proposal is to improve accessibility from four classrooms to the external play area at Christ Church CE Primary School in Bootle. This will involve resurfacing an area of playground to bring it level with the classroom doors at an estimated cost of £9,000. This will ensure that pupils, already attending the school, will have greater access to external play areas.
- 2.4 Maghull High School, Maghull is designated as a school for pupils with physical disabilities and caters for a number of pupils in wheelchairs. The first floor areas of the school have evacuation chairs so that pupils in wheelchairs can be safely escorted from the building in case of fire. However, the four storey science block presents a problem simply because of the number of stairs and the difficulty of evacuating secondary age pupils over such a distance. It is therefore proposed to convert the existing lift to an evacuation lift which could be used in an emergency. The lift would have its own power supply and intercom system. The estimated cost is £34,331.
- 2.5 The total cost of proposals detailed above is £51,331 which, if approved, would leave a balance of £38,946 to support further schemes.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Cabinet Member, Children, Schools & Families is recommended to:-

- i). approve the proposed schemes detailed in this report;
- ii). refer the funding to Cabinet for inclusion in the 2010/11 Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member - Children's Services
Cabinet

DATE: 7 December 2010
16 December 2010

SUBJECT: Sure Start Early Years And Childcare Grant - Quality And
Access 2010/11

**WARDS
AFFECTED:** All Wards

REPORT OF: Peter Morgan
Strategic Director - Children, Schools & Families

**CONTACT
OFFICER:** Chris Dalziel (0151 934 3337)

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** NO

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to update Members on the approved schemes and to seek approval for additional schemes.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

The Cabinet Member, Children, Schools & Families has delegated powers to approve the proposed additional schemes and to refer them to Cabinet for inclusion in the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

The Cabinet Member is recommended to:-

- i). note the update on previously approved schemes;
- ii). approve the proposed additional schemes;
- iii). refer the funding to Cabinet for inclusion in the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

KEY DECISION: No.

FORWARD PLAN: Not appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the expiry of the "call-in" period for the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting.

Agenda Item 7

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

Not appropriate.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: None.

Financial: There are no financial implications for the Council's general capital resources as all funding is from specific resources. Proposals will be funded from the Sure Start Early Years and Childcare Grant 2010/11.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: None.

Risk Assessment: There are no financial risks associated with this report as all funding is from specific resources.

Asset Management: Not appropriate.

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

FD564 - The Head of Corporate Finance and Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on the report.

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | ✓ | | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | ✓ | | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | ✓ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | ✓ | | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | ✓ | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | ✓ | | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | ✓ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | ✓ | | |

LINKS TO ENSURING INTEGRATION:

The proposals will contribute to the Extended Schools agenda, which integrates the five elements of the Every Child Matters agenda. The proposals will also link to the following CYPP priorities:

- ❖ Create and maintain an environment where people feel safe;
- ❖ Create highly effective, inclusive learning environments for all age groups where learners can enjoy and achieve;
- ❖ Create a culture and an environment where people can make a positive contribution to their community.

IMPACT UPON CHILDREN, SCHOOLS & FAMILIES TARGETS AND PRIORITIES:

The proposals will have a positive impact on and contribute to the five CYPP targets and the following LAA targets.

- ❖ Educational achievement and training;
- ❖ Health of children and young people;
- ❖ Making a positive contribution;
- ❖ Community involvement;
- ❖ Statutory education targets.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

- ❖ Report to Cabinet Member and Cabinet – 1/10 June 2010 – Sure Start Early Years and Childcare Grant: Quality and Access 2010/11.
- ❖ Report to Cabinet Member and Cabinet – 13/15 April 2010 – Sure Start Early Years and Childcare Grant: Quality and Access 2010/11.

Agenda Item 7

SURE START EARLY YEARS AND CHILDCARE GRANT: QUALITY AND ACCESS 2010/11: UPDATE

1. Background

- 1.1 Members will recall that Sefton MBC received a £960,958 Sure Start Early Years and Childcare Grant (EYCG): Quality and Access in 2010/11.
- 1.2 All funding was allocated to provide improvements in 20 Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) settings. The majority of these schemes are progressing well with some already completed.
- 1.3 This is a ring-fenced grant.

2. Additional Proposals

- 2.1 Savings have been made on some of the schemes due either to favourable market prices or slight modifications to original approved schemes.
- 2.2 This has resulted in savings of approximately £105,000. It is proposed to reconsider the scheme put forward by JETS Out of School Club which will provide much improved accommodation for pupils, aged 3 to 14, using this facility at the start and end of the school day. The rooms will be renovated with accessible provision for children with physical disabilities which is not currently available and the opportunities for physical play will be extended.
- 2.3 The JETS proposal is estimated at £90,000 leaving a balance of £15,000. It is proposed to provide external play equipment at a number of PVI settings and any further savings as approved schemes will also be used in this way. The Sefton Early Years Childcare Quality and Inclusion Service will work with the PVI settings to ensure that equipment will help to develop creative learning spaces and have a direct impact on outcomes, achievements and attainments.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Cabinet Member is recommended to:-
 - i). note the update on previously approved schemes;
 - ii). approve the proposed additional schemes;
 - iii). refer the funding to Cabinet for inclusion in the Children, Schools & Families Capital Programme 2010/11.

Agenda Item 8

REPORT TO: Cabinet

DATE: 16 December 2010

SUBJECT: Playbuilder Capital Grant 2010/11

WARDS AFFECTED: All Wards

REPORT OF: Peter Morgan
Strategic Director - Children, Schools & Families

CONTACT OFFICER: Chris Dalziel (0151 934 3337)

EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL: NO

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

To advise Members of the revised Play Capital allocation so that a decision can be made on how the grant will be utilised.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

Cabinet is required to make a decision on how the Playbuilder Capital 2010/11 should be expended.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Cabinet is recommended to consider the options detailed in this report at 3.1 and to advise on the preferred option to be progressed.

KEY DECISION: No.

FORWARD PLAN: Not appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the expiry of the “call-in” period for the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting.

Agenda Item 8

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

Not appropriate.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: None.

Financial: There are no financial implications for the Council's general resources as all funding is from specific resources i.e. the Playbuilder Capital Grant 2010/11.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: None.

Risk Assessment: There are no risks associated with this report as all funding is from specific resources.

Asset Management: Not appropriate.

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

FD 572 - The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on this report.

Agenda Item 8

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | | ✓ | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | ✓ | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | ✓ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | | ✓ | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | ✓ | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | | ✓ | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | | ✓ | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | | ✓ | |

LINKS TO ENSURING INTEGRATION:

Not appropriate.

IMPACT UPON CHILDREN, SCHOOLS & FAMILIES TARGETS AND PRIORITIES:

Not appropriate.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Report to Cabinet – 8 July 2010 – Playbuilder Capital Grant: 2010/11.

Agenda Item 8

PLAYBUILDER CAPITAL GRANT 2010/11

1. Background

- 1.1 Members will recall that approval was given on 8 July 2010 to progress 8 Playbuilder schemes as detailed below.
- Maghull Town Council – Glenn Park
 - Maghull Town Council – Dodds Park
 - Aintree Village Parish Council – Harrow Drive
 - Lydiate Parish Council – Sandy Lane
 - Netherton Park Neighbourhood Centre
 - Sefton Leisure Services – Moorside Park, Crosby
 - Sefton Leisure Services – Deansgate Lane Park, Formby
 - Sefton Leisure Services – Crossens Community Park, Southport.
- 1.2 The allocation of capital was £440,174 and it was proposed that each of the 8 play proposals would receive £55,201 in grant funding.
- 1.3 Members will further recall that the ring-fence was removed from this grant on 10 June 2010 and on 15 July 2010 the DfE informed authorities that 'with immediate effect and until further notice, all of those local authorities should avoid incurring any new contractual liabilities in relation to their play capital grants'. Sefton had not entered into any contractual agreements at this time and DfE were informed accordingly. The schemes were therefore deferred pending further consideration by the DfE.

2. Update on Capital Allocation

- 2.1 On 20 October 2010 a letter was received from the Secretary of State advising of a revised allocation for play capital for all authorities. A saving of £20.8 million has been made on the original budget of £75 million and a further Grant Determination letter which will give the specific terms and conditions is awaited. The letter of 20 October 2010 confirms that the ring-fence has been removed from the grant 'to give more flexibility to manage local budgets'. However the letter makes it clear that the capital funding must be spent by 31 March 2011.
- 2.2 The capital allocation for Sefton has been reduced from £440,174 to £275,041.25. The funding has to be used for capital purposes by 31 March 2011 and cannot be rolled forward.
- 2.3 Retention on schemes completed in 2009/10 amounts to £7,844.87 leaving £267,196.38 available in 2010/11.
- 2.4 Aintree Parish Council has asked to be reimbursed for £2,510 that they have already spent on preparatory work. If members agree to this request then available funding would be further reduced to £264,686.38.

3. Options

3.1 There are a number of options which could be considered for this revised allocation as detailed below.

- Progress the 8 proposed Playbuilder schemes but allocate a reduced budget of approximately £33,085 to each scheme.
- Progress 5 of the proposed Playbuilder schemes and allocate a budget of approximately £52,937 to each scheme. This approximates to the original allocation for each of the 8 schemes.
- Allocate the grant of £267,196.38 (or £264,686.38 if Aintree Parish Council receive reimbursement) to an alternative major capital scheme within the Council's Capital Programme to replace prudential borrowing. This would result in a revenue saving to the Council in the order of £24,000 per year.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Cabinet is recommended to consider the options detailed in this report at 3.1 and to advise on the preferred option to be progressed.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

REPORT TO: Cabinet

DATE: 16th December 2010

SUBJECT: Bedford and Queens Road, Bootle Programme for Demolition and Clearance Phase II - Proposed Extension of Existing Contract

WARDS AFFECTED: Linacre & Derby

REPORT OF: Bill Millburn
Strategic Director for Communities

CONTACT OFFICER: David Kay
Architecture and Buildings Manager
Tel No. 0151 934 4527

EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL: No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

To advise members of the proposed 12 months extension of the existing contract in respect of the Bedford & Queens Road, Bootle Demolition and Clearance Programme II and approve additional expenditure for the contract with the incumbent contractor.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

The value of the tender received exceeds the approval level delegated to the Cabinet Member.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

It is recommended that

- (i) Cabinet approves a further 12 months extension of the existing contract and additional expenditure in the sum of £350,000.00 with the incumbent contractor for the Bedford/Queens Road, Bootle programme of demolition and clearance II; and
- (ii) Subject to (i) above the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services be requested to agree an extension of the existing contract with the incumbent contractor.

KEY DECISION: No

FORWARD PLAN: Not Appropriate

Agenda Item 9

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the expiry of the Call in Period for the minutes of this meeting.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

There are no alternative options. These works are necessary to allow the redevelopment programme to proceed.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: Bedford / Queens Road, Bootle Demolition & Clearance Programme.

Financial: Specific funding exists within the H.M.R.I. Capital Programme for clearance and demolition comprising H.M.R.I. Grant or Housing Capital Resources.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: None

Risk Assessment: Project covered by CDM Regulations.

Asset Management: This investment will allow the programme of rebuilding modern homes in the Bedford/Queens Area.

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS
 FD 576 - The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on this report
 LD 0006/10 - The Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services has been consulted and his comments have been incorporated into this report.

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | | ✓ | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | ✓ | | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | ✓ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | ✓ | | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | ✓ | | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | | ✓ | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | ✓ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | ✓ | | |

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Agenda Item 9

BACKGROUND:

1.0 **H.M.R.I. Capital Programme**

- 1.1 HMRI has identified several unoccupied and derelict properties located in the Bedford/Queens Road, Bootle redevelopment area. As part of the HMRI strategy, the houses are purchased and later demolished. Each time there is a need to demolish one or more of these properties, quotations / tenders have to be obtained as part of the Councils financial process. This process has proceeded to date using the authority to Chief Officers.
- 1.2 While adhering to these procedures, which include the preparation of Health and Safety plans there are inevitable delays. Some of the properties become targeted by vandals and thieves causing damage to the structure, making the buildings unsafe to enter, and allowing water ingress to adjoining properties.
- 1.3 To help alleviate this situation, tenders have been sought and the Council has appointed a contractor to undertake a rolling programme of property demolition as identified by HMRI in the Bedford/Queens redevelopment area.

2.0 **Tender Action**

- 2.1 Tenders were sought in 2009 but not awarded until 2010, The successful tenderer was 'The Beech Group' in the sum of £956,531.00 with a fixed price contract for a period of 12 months(start date 02/01/2010), following this period costs will be subject to an annual increase based on BCIS (Building cost indices services)

3.0 **Financial Analysis**

- 3.1 The contract was based on the submission of rates for a range of different building types and amounts including service disconnections and gable end treatment.
- 3.2 During the term of the contract there have been several variations due to delays with CPO's and the inclusion of additional properties, this has led to the need to increase the existing budget provision and extend the existing contract with nil rate increase in year 1(start date 02/01/2010 – completion date 01/01/2011) and the minimum rate increase as identified in the building cost indices service in year 2 extension (start date 02/01/2011 – completion date 01/02/2012).
- 3.3 Best value can be demonstrated by having the appointed contractor available to mobilised very quickly to alleviate any H&S issues and that the original tender received was substantially lower than those submitted in 2009, It must also be noted that if re tendered would attract a higher consultancy fee rate.

3.4 The expenditure on this scheme to date is within the original budget provision but is expected to rise by £350,000.00 due to the inclusion of additional properties that will require demolition.

4.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that

- (i) Cabinet approves a further 12 months extension of the existing contract and additional expenditure in the sum of £350,000.00 with the incumbent contractor for the Bedford/Queens Road, Bootle programme of demolition and clearance II.
- (ii) Subject to (i) above the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services be requested to agree an extension of the existing contract with the incumbent contractor.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10

REPORT TO: Cabinet

DATE: 16th December 2010

SUBJECT: ROK Building Ltd (in Administration)

**WARDS
AFFECTED:** Linacre, Litherland, Derby, Dukes, Kew, Norwood

REPORT OF: Peter Moore
Environmental and Technical Services Director

**CONTACT
OFFICER:** David Kay
Client Manager
Tel: 0151 934 4527

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

The report is to advise members of the position with regards to ROK Building Ltd (In administration), to advise on the options available for completion of the works and seeks authorisation to explore these options.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

To enable the Environmental and Technical Services Director to act in order for the works to be recommenced and completed as soon as possible and in a manner most advantageous to the Authority.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Cabinet is recommended to:

- (i) Note the situation arising through ROK Building Ltd entering administration and the potential implications for the Authority.
- (ii) Authorise the Director of Environmental and Technical Services and the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services to investigate the options available for recommencement and completion of the contracts and report back to the Cabinet on the most advantageous proposals in due course.

KEY DECISION: No

FORWARD PLAN: Not Appropriate

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Immediately following expiry of call in.

Agenda Item 10

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

All reasonable alternative options will be considered but only those options affording the Council the best opportunity to complete the outstanding works as quickly as possible and at no additional cost will be adopted.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: There are currently capital provisions totalling £3,032,000 £1,895,870 and £780,260 in connection with the Southport Market, Lander Road Primary and Kew Woods Primary projects respectively.

Financial It is not anticipated that the Authority will incur any additional costs over and above the current funding provision.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | N/A | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | N/A | | | |

Legal: See below

Risk Assessment: Not appropriate

Asset Management: Not Applicable

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

The Children's Schools and families and the Leisure Services and Tourism Department have been consulted and any comments have been taken into account in preparing this report.

FD comment: The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and his comments have been incorporated into this report. (FD 574)

LD Comment: The Head of Corporate Legal Services has been consulted and his comments have been incorporated into this report. (LD0004/10)

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | | √ | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | √ | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | √ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | | √ | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | √ | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | | √ | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | | √ | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | | √ | |

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Children School's and Families and Leisure Services and Tourism Capital Programmes

Agenda Item 10

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Cabinet, at its meetings on 19th March 2009 and 5th August 2010 approved acceptance of tenders in respect of the St Peters House fit out, Southport Market refurbishment and the Kew Woods Primary classroom extension projects. (Minutes 298. 75. and 79. refers)
- 1.2 Cabinet Urgent Business Committee, at its meeting on 11th March 2010 approved acceptance of the lowest tender received in connection with the Lander Road Primary School extension and remodelling project. (Minute 23 refers)
- 1.3 In each instance the contractor approved for acceptance was ROK Building Ltd based in Rochdale.
- 1.4 Unfortunately the entire ROK Group were placed in administration on Monday 8th November 2010 and works on all of the Sefton Projects was suspended.

2.0 Current Situation

- 2.1 The works at St Peters House were essentially completed in late November 2009. The period of defects liability is shortly due to expire and there are a small number of defects arising, which the Authority will want to see made good.
- 2.2 The works on all three of the other projects have commenced but were some way from completion, the works contract values and contractually agreed completion dates are as follows:

| Scheme | Contract Value | Completion Date |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Southport Market | £1,966,039 | 23/09/2011 |
| Lander Road Primary School | £1,521,936 | 06/06/2011 |
| Kew Woods Primary School | £633,646 | 04/03/2011 |

- 2.3 The funding for works at Lander Road School is partially provided through a Primary Capital grant, which must be expended by August 2011. The works are also quite intrusive on the operation of the school and clearly a prompt recommencement of the works here would be advantageous.
- 2.4 The funding for the works to the Southport Market is not time limited and while the works are relatively self-contained it would be advantageous if the recommended contract were to be completed ahead of the busy Christmas period trading in late 2011.
- 2.5 The funding for the works at Kew Woods is again not time limited and as the works are self-contained the current suspension does not present immediate difficulties. It would however be advantageous if the works were completed prior to the end of the school summer term in July 2011.

- 2.6 The appropriate actions have been taken since the 8th November to secure the sites and thereby to protect the Authority's interest in connection with the works completed to date.
- 2.7 The provider of performance bonds, which can allow the Authority to recover additional costs up to 10% of the contract values has been advised.
- 2.8 Payments due to be released to ROK Building Ltd have been withheld in accordance with the provisions of the contract and no further payment will be made before matters are fully resolved.

3.0 Options for Completion of the Works

- 3.1 The Authority has a right under the contract to terminate the employment of ROK Building Ltd, as they have become insolvent.
- 3.2 However the initial indication from the appointed administrators was that they were exploring options to sell the ROK Group as a single entity and as a going concern. As such a proposal would provide the Authority with the best opportunity for the works to be recommenced quickly and completed at no additional cost the option to terminate the contracts has not thus far been acted upon.
- 3.3 Unfortunately it would now appear that although some elements of the group have been sold these do not include the arm of the business that was undertaking the works for Sefton. While it will still be appropriate to consider any proposals that are put forward by the administrator it is also necessary now to consider alternative options for completion of the works.
- 3.4 The Authority is holding payment for works completed by ROK Building Ltd prior to their administration. This, and the performance bond, can be utilised to ensure that the Authority does not incur any additional costs in completing the works.
- 3.5 The authority is however obliged, with limited latitude, to ensure that the works are completed at a minimum additional cost thereby maximising the amount recoverable by the administrator and minimise any call on the performance bond.
- 3.6 The normal manner in which this is demonstrable without obtaining further tenders, which would clearly delay recommencement, is to explore the costs for completion with the contractors who submitted tenders in the original complete tender submission.
- 3.7 Without making any commitment at this stage the Authority's technical service provider, Capita Symonds, have commenced provisional discussions with the relevant contractors.

Agenda Item 10

4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1 Capita Symonds have provisionally assessed the amount of payment due to ROK Building Ltd for the works carried out prior to their administration but currently withheld by the Authority. This is as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Southport Market | £119,939 |
| Lander Road Primary School | £67,480 to be confirmed |
| Kew Woods Primary School | £38,731 |
| St Peters House | £37,028 |

- 4.2 These payments will be held until such time as the final cost to the council is established and payments only released to the administrators after any additional costs incurred by the Authority are deducted.
- 4.3 In the event that the above, withheld, payments are not sufficient to meet the additional costs incurred then, in all but the St Peters House project, there is also an opportunity to seek recourse to the performance bonds.
- 4.4 It is not currently anticipated therefore that the Authority will incur any additional costs over and above the current funding provision.

5.0 Proposed Way Forward

- 5.1 It is proposed that all reasonable options for recommencement of the works should be considered, including those that may still be put forward by the administrator.
- 5.2 In order to fully consider the options available, and identify those that provide the most advantageous solution, it will be necessary to authorise officers to enter into negotiation and provisionally agree an arrangement with the prospective replacement contractors.
- 5.3 Any proposed arrangement will look to ensure that the works to be recommenced as quickly as possible and completed without any additional cost to the Authority. The Administrator and bondspersons will be asked to agree and support the proposals.
- 5.4 These final proposals will be reported to Members at the earliest possible opportunity and, if possible, a further update will be provided on the day at this meeting.
- 5.5 Members are requested to note that it may be necessary to obtain authorisation quickly in order to ensure that the over riding time constraints, as outlined in paragraph 2.3 to 2.5 are achieved and it may therefore be necessary to ask for the matters to be considered at an Urgent Business Cabinet meeting.

6.0 Recommendation

Cabinet is recommended to:

- (i) Note the situation arising through ROK Building Ltd entering administration and the potential implications for the Authority.
- (ii) Authorise the Director of Environmental and Technical Services and the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services to investigate the options available for recommencement and completion of the contracts and report to Members on the most advantageous proposals in due course.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 11

REPORT TO: Cabinet

DATE: 16th December 2010

SUBJECT: Bedford Primary School, Bootle - Provision of new Family Room Extension

WARDS AFFECTED: Linacre & Derby

REPORT OF: Peter Moore
Environmental and Technical Services

CONTACT OFFICER: David Kay
Architecture and Buildings Manager
Tel No. 0151 934 4527

EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL: No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

This report is to advise Members of tenders received in respect of a proposed New Family Room at Bedford Primary School, Bootle.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

To enable acceptance of tenders and to thereby allow the timetable for implementation and expenditure to be met.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

It is recommended that:

- I. Cabinet approves acceptance of the lowest tender received.
- II. Subject to (i) above the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services be requested to enter into a formal contract with the successful tenderer.

KEY DECISION: No

FORWARD PLAN: Not appropriate

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Immediately following expiry of the call in period

Agenda Item 11

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

All alternative options have been considered and have been discounted.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: A Funding provision of £275,000.00 is available for this scheme comprising:

Devolved Formula Capital £123,270.00
 Extended Schools Budget £100,000.00
 School Budgets £ 51,730.00

All funding is contained within the Children's Services Capital Programme

Financial: Tenders for the main contract works have been invited and are due to be received on 14th December 2010.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010/ 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: Not appropriate

Risk Assessment: Not appropriate

Asset Management: Not applicable

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

FD 568 The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and his comments have been incorporated into this report.

LD 0005/10 The Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services has been consulted and has no comments on this report.

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | √ | | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | √ | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | √ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | √ | | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | √ | | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | √ | | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | √ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | √ | | |

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Children's Services Capital Programme

Agenda Item 11

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Identified within the Children's Services Capital Programme is a scheme for the provision of a new Family Room Extension.
- 1.2 The scheme includes for the provision of a new purpose built extension to provide much needed additional accommodation to support family learning both at the school and for parents of pupils at the nearby Cambridge Road Nursery and Children's Centre.

2.0 TENDER ACTION

- 2.1 Tenders to carry out the works have been invited from suitably qualified and experienced contractors, as follows (in alphabetical order)

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| J. Armor | Liverpool |
| Eaga | Prescot |
| D. Henderson | Southport |
| Lockwoods | Bootle |
| Mellwood Construction | Southport |
| Rigby Building Contractors | Southport |

- 2.2 Tenders will be received on 14th December 2010 and details of the tenders received will be reported to Members on the day of the meeting.
- 2.3 Tenders received will be subject to technical and arithmetical checking. Acceptance of a tender will be subject to such checking.

3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The overall financial implications of the tenders received will be reported to Members on the day of the meeting.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- I. Cabinet approves acceptance of the lowest tender received.
- II. Subject to (i) above the Acting Head of Corporate Legal Services be requested to enter into a formal contract with the successful tenderer.

Agenda Item 12

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member Technical Services
Cabinet

DATE: 15th December 2010
16th December 2010

SUBJECT: Thornton Switch Island Link – Best And Final Funding Bid

**WARDS
AFFECTED:** Park, St Oswald, Netherton & Orrell, Molyneux, Manor,
Sudell

REPORT OF: Andy Wallis, Planning and Economic Development Director

**CONTACT
OFFICER:** Stuart Waldron, Assistant Director, Transportation & Spatial
Planning – Telephone 0151 934 4235
Stephen Birch, Transportation & Development
Telephone 0151 934 4225

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

In October 2010 the Department for Transport (DfT) advised the Council that the Thornton Switch Island Link that had previously been granted Programme Entry within the Department's Major Scheme Funding Programme, had further to the Comprehensive Spending Review, been prioritised in the Supported Pool of schemes. Supported Pool status means the DfT are prepared to find funding support for the scheme subject to agreeing a 'best and final funding bid'. The purpose of the report is to seek Cabinet approval to the Council's 'best and final funding bid' prior to submission to the DfT by the deadline of 4th January 2011.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

If the Council wish to proceed with the scheme the Government expect a financial commitment from the Authority and have requested the Authority to make a 'best and final funding bid'. As a budget issue the Cabinet need to approve the revised funding package.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

It is recommended that:

Cabinet Member - Technical Services

- i) notes the report
- ii) recommends that Cabinet approves the funding proposals included in the report, including the Council's contribution for submission to the Department for Transport as the 'best and final funding bid'.

Agenda Item 12

Cabinet

- i) notes the report.
- ii) approves the funding proposals outlined in the report, including the Council's contribution, to be submitted to the Department for Transport as the Council's 'best and final funding bid' for apportioning funding commitment for the scheme.

KEY DECISION:

Yes

FORWARD PLAN:

No. – Rule 15 authorised by the Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Performance and Corporate Services).

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Following expiry of the 'call in' period for the minutes of the meeting

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS: N/A

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework:

Financial: Proposed commitment contained within Council's previously approved allocation in the medium term financial plan. Subject to confirmation by the DfT, a revised funding profile for the Council's allocation will be submitted to Cabinet for approval.

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2010 2011 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ | 2013/ 2014 £ |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal:

Risk Assessment: The proposed funding bid will be subject to approval by the Department for Transport. Should the scheme not proceed, any costs incurred by the Council may be classed as abortive. Capital accounting rules require that abortive costs are charged to revenue which would require them to be funded from the general Fund Balances.

If the proposed funding bid is accepted by the Department for Transport, the DfT contribution will be fixed at the proposed amount. This means that the Council will be responsible for any additional costs arising from the project, such as costs associated with changes in the project or any overspend. Should any overspend exceed the contingency that has been retained within the proposed scheme budget, additional capital resources would be required.

Asset Management: N/A

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS
FD575 The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on this report.
LEGAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | | √ | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | √ | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | √ | | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | √ | | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | √ | | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | | √ | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | √ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | | √ | |

Agenda Item 12

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Cabinet - 17th May 2007 – Thornton Switch Island Link Scheme – Funding
Cabinet - 29th November 2010 – Thornton Switch Island Link – Funding
Cabinet - 2nd October 2008 – Thornton switch Island Link – Programme Entry
Cabinet - 1st October 2009 – Thornton Switch Island Link Commissioning Report/
Revised Project Management/Programme and Scheme cost profile
Cabinet - 10th June 2010 – Thornton Switch Island Link – Current Situation

1. Background

- 1.1 A report to Cabinet on the 10th June 2010 indicated that the new Government was to review all spending plans for major schemes approved by the previous administration. This included the Thornton Switch Island Link Road scheme, that was effectively put on hold until after the Comprehensive Spending Review was announced in October 2010. Any future expenditure would be at the Council's expense.
- 1.2 Cabinet agreed to permit the submission of the Planning Application to proceed, but all other work was halted.
- 1.3 On 29th October 2010 the DfT advised the Council that further to the Government's announcement of the outcome of the Spending Review on 20th October 2010, plans for major schemes had been announced.
- 1.4 The DfT advised that schemes that had previously been granted Programme Entry, ie an acceptable Business Case had been submitted and approved, had been prioritised into three pools: the Supported Pool; the Development Pool; and the Pre-Qualification Pool.
- 1.5 Thornton to Switch Island Link was in the Supported Pool. This meant the DfT was prepared to fund the scheme subject to the Council submitting a 'best and final funding bid' by the end of December. The Department expected the Council to demonstrate in this bid that all opportunities for cost savings and value maximisation had been explored and incorporated into the funding package.
- 1.6 On 11th November 2010 the Council received further guidance and a form for submission of the Council's 'Best and Final Funding Bid'. The main requirements can be summarised as follows:
 - Ministers want to ensure all reasonable efforts have been made both to reduce costs and secure additional funding.
 - provide an opportunity for the Council to make significant improvements to the scheme proposals in this competitive process. (DfT will provide guidance but the final judgement on the bid is the Council's responsibility).
 - bid to be submitted by Tuesday 4th January 2011.
- 1.7 Further consultation with the nominated DfT officials would indicate:
 - there is insufficient funding to enable all 10 schemes from across the country to be funded at the levels identified in the approved Business Cases when Programme Entry was granted.
 - the Minister is expecting a reduced DfT contribution to that agreed at Programme Entry stage, ie the Council contribution will have to increase either from its own resources or a third party.

Agenda Item 12

- no indication of the scale of increased contribution has been given, or whether an opportunity to negotiate will be given.

1.8 The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the funding issues relating to the scheme and make a recommendation of the proposed 'best and final bid'.

2. Current Position with Scheme Progress

2.1 The Planning Application was submitted in July 2010 and will be considered by Planning Committee on 15th December 2010. Cabinet will be advised verbally of the Committee's decision.

2.2 If approved, as a development in the Green Belt, it will have to be referred to Government Office. GONW may decide to 'call-in' the application, which almost certainly leads to Public Inquiry being held.

2.3 Subject to Planning approval it will also be necessary to commence the statutory procedures to progress a Side Roads Order, for the closure of roads that cross the proposed route, and a Compulsory Purchase Order should purchase of land by negotiation fail, that may also require consideration at a Public Inquiry.

2.4 The Council is well positioned to review scheme costs now a firmer programme is emerging should funding be approved. The appointment of a Contractor / Consultant consortium to design and deliver the scheme at an early stage means that a range of skills, experience and up-to-date knowledge of the construction industry can be drawn on that will permit accurate costings to be determined.

2.5 Furthermore the scheme in highway engineering terms is relatively straightforward. There are no major high value structures to be built that have high risk funding implications and work on previous schemes over many years, supplemented by recent surveys, has given a very good understanding of conditions that can be expected to be encountered during construction. Progress with design and discussions with parties affected by the scheme has also enabled details to be agreed that again gives more certainty in scheme costs, thus reducing the contingency elements to be included.

2.6 As indicated above the scheme has been prioritised in the Supported Pool of major national transport schemes. The DfT have undertaken a review of the Benefit Cost Ratio's (BCR) of these ten schemes to ensure a consistent assessment. The BCR is an indication of the benefits that can be attributed a monetary value (ie journey time savings, reliability, wider economic impacts etc). The assessment for Thornton Switch Island Link has increased from 12.14 to 34.64. When the scheme was granted Programme Entry under the previous administrations guidance a BCR in excess of 2 was required to show value for money.

3. Funding Commitment to Date

3.1 In May 2007 Cabinet approved the following funding package for inclusion in the Capital Programme. This was based on DfT guidance that required a minimum 10% contribution from the scheme promoter to the base costs, and inclusion of an Additional Risk Layer (Optimism Bias) to cover the potential for additional cost during scheme development and during delivery on site, this allowance to be shared equally. Consequently, the following was approved:

| | Estimated Cost £m | Funding Responsibility | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | | DfT £m | Sefton £m |
| <u>Quantified Cost Estimate (QCE)</u> | | | |
| Eligible Preparation Cost | 0.992 | | |
| Construction Cost | 9.552 | | |
| Supervision | 0.413 | | |
| Statutory Undertaking Cost | 0.250 | | |
| Qualified Risk Assessment | <u>1.680</u> | | |
| Total | 12.887 | 11.598 | 1.289 |
| Inflation Allowance | <u>7.123</u> | <u>5.593</u> | <u>1.530</u> |
| TOTAL QCE | 20.010 | 17.191 | 2.819 |
| Additional Risk Layer (level set by DfT) | 5.187 | 2.594 | 2.593 |
| Non-Eligible Costs (Land, Order process etc) | <u>0.500</u> | | <u>0.500</u> |
| TOTAL | <u>£25.697m</u> | <u>£19.785m</u> | <u>£ 5.912m</u> |

(Costs based on 2005 prices)

3.2 The Council was advised that the scheme had been granted Programme Entry on the 15th September 2008, at which time the following funding package was accepted in the programme as a basis to permit the scheme to move through the development stages:

| | Total £m | DfT £m | Sefton £m |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Quantified Cost Estimate (QCE) (inc Inflation Allowance) | 17.351 | 15.616 | 1.735 |
| Additional Risk Layer | 3.817 | 1.909 | 1.908 |
| Total | <u>£21.168m</u> | <u>£17.525m</u> | <u>£3.643m</u> |

Agenda Item 12

- 3.3 The main changes, resulting in a lower cost estimate being accepted at this stage by the DfT were a result of changes in the calculation of the Inflation Allowance and Additional Risk Layer based on revised information and guidance.
- 3.4 The overall allowance for the scheme of £5.912m in the Council's Capital Programme was not amended because non-eligible costs still had to be covered. In addition, as the funding was spread over a number of financial years to 2012/13, it was considered appropriate to retain the balance in the programme for potential additional costs as scheme development progressed and potential increases in the risk allocation.
- 3.5 The profile of the Council's commitment has been reported to Cabinet at the following meetings to keep the Medium Term Financial Plan up-to-date: 17th May 2007, 29th November 2007, 2nd October 2008, 1st October 2009 and 10th June 2010.

4. Current Funding Status

- 4.1 With the approval of the scheme by the new Government, further to the Comprehensive Spending Review and inclusion in the 'Supported Pool' of major schemes, the Department for Transport have announced revised funding arrangements.
- 4.2 The current scheme funding has been accepted as:

| | £m |
|--|--------|
| Estimated Total Scheme Cost (inclusive of eligible preparation costs) | 17.351 |
| DfT Contribution | 15.616 |
| Local Authority Contribution | 1.735 |
| Third Party Contribution | Nil |

5. 'Best and Final' Funding Bid

- 5.1 As indicated in 1.5–1.6 above the DfT has now established a competitive process for the Local Authorities with schemes in the 'Supported Pool'. In addition all allowances for funding Additional Risk Layers (Optimism Bias) have been removed.
- 5.2 Hence the DfT is asking promoting Local Authorities to identify a fixed contribution from the DfT that cannot be altered in the future and furthermore shows a reduction on the previously approved £15.616m. For clarity this would

Agenda Item 12

mean that any additional costs after the funding package is approved will fall on the Council as promoting authority.

Up-to-date Scheme Costs

- 5.3 Further to the cost estimate submitted in the Business Case, scheme development has moved on in that the details such as alignments, drainage proposals, carriageway construction, have all now been agreed as have revisions to the VOSA Vehicle Testing site at the Switch Island junction. The Planning Application has been submitted and further work on land requirement progressed. Hence a more accurate scheme cost can be determined. In addition, with a contractor already involved, costs based on commercial experience can be used. Therefore, a workshop has been held with all the delivery partners where the scheme programme and delivery processes were broken down into detail and costed accordingly. At this stage it has been assumed the delivery programme will include a Public Inquiry as a result of a 'call-in' to the Planning Application and possibly the Side Road / Compulsory Purchase Orders.
- 5.4 In addition a robust assessment of the opportunities for value engineering opportunities (ie alternative measures / materials / processes that result in a cost saving) has been undertaken and a full review of the risk register and allocated contingency costs has been completed.
- 5.5 Consequently the following table indicates the current cost of the scheme as now proposed, the cost savings that can be generated through value engineering etc and a revised scheme cost.

| | Costs at Nov 2010 £'m | Cost Savings £'m | Revised Cost £'m |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Preparatory Costs (Eligible Only) - Phase 1a / Prelim Design, Environmental Assessment & Planning Application (<i>Actual completed cost</i>) | 1.492 | 0 | 1.492 |
| - Phase 1b (Statutory Process, Detail Design) | 1.083 | 0.130 | 0.953 |
| Construction Costs (Inc Supervision) | 14.044 | 0.813 | 13.231 |
| Statutory Undertaking Costs | 0.720 | 0 | 0.720 |
| Risk | 1.685 | 0.503 | 1.182 |
| Inflation | 1.254 | 0.244 | 1.010 |
| Eligible Scheme Costs | <u>£20.278</u> | <u>£1.690</u> | <u>£18.588</u> |

Agenda Item 12

| | Costs at Nov 2010 £'m | Cost Savings £'m | Revised Cost £'m |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Ineligible Preparation Costs | 0.200 | 0 | 0.200 |
| Land Cost | 0.500 | 0.050 | 0.450 |
| Total Scheme Cost Estimate November 2010 | <u>£20.978m</u> | <u>£ 1.740m</u> | <u>£19.238m</u> |

Note

- 1) The increase over the Business Case estimate is as expected, taking account of the development of the scheme up to submission of the Planning Application, and increased costs between 2005 and 2010. Based on the 2005 original estimates these additional costs are in line with those anticipated and covered within the Additional Risk Layer (Optimism Bias).
- 2) Should a Public Inquiry not be required it is estimated this will save £0.2m of Ineligible Preparation Costs.

Best and Final Funding Bid

- 5.6 In determining the Best and Final Funding Bid to the DfT for determining their fixed contribution the following needs to be taken into consideration:
- there needs to be a significant reduction in that previously indicated.
 - the Council have allocated £5.912m in the Capital Programme based on previous estimates and guidance.
 - the strong commitment to delivering the scheme balanced against the other financial pressures on the authority.

Proposal

- 5.7 Original guidance required a minimum 10% contribution. 10% of the current Eligible Costs = £1.859m. Hence a 90% contribution from DfT = £16.729m, against the currently indicated allocation of £15.616m.
- 5.8 The Council has £5.912m allocated to the scheme which it is recommended be retained at this level. Hence with known ineligible costs of £0.650 and allowing for a contingency layer to cover potential additional costs and possibly the cost of the associated traffic calming and safety works on the existing roads to ensure strategic through traffic makes best use of the road, then it is considered a Council contribution of approximately £4.0m could be sustained.

5.9 This would give an overall cost profile of:

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Estimated Total Outturn Cost | £18.588m |
| Local Authority Contribution | £ 4.088m (22%) |
| DfT <u>Fixed</u> Contribution | £14.500m (78%) |

5.10 This would offer the DfT a saving of £1.116m on the previously indicated contribution, over and above the removal of the Additional Risk Layer allocation.

5.11 The Council's funding can therefore be summarised as:

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| Local Authority Contribution | £4.088m |
| Ineligible Costs | £0.650m |
| Contingency | £1.174m |
| TOTAL | £5.912m |

5.12 The DfT have circulated a form for the Council to submit its funding bid and a draft version, incorporating the above funding proposal is attached as Annex A.

6. Conclusions

6.1 The Council has been promoting this scheme for many years and there is overwhelming public support for the scheme, as demonstrated by the public consultations undertaken over recent years.

6.2 The Government has fully recognised the benefits and value for money the scheme offers by initially granting Programme Entry in September 2008, and now the scheme is one of only 10 schemes nationally to be placed in the 'Supported Pool' by the new administration.

6.3 The Council recognises the current funding constraints and wishes to work with the Department for Transport to agree a funding package that is acceptable to both partners.

6.4 The funding package set out in the report and the required DfT form is considered deliverable within the current allocation in the Council's Capital Programme, with an allowance for additional costs that become the scheme promoter's responsibility.

Agenda Item 12

7. Recommendation(s)

That Cabinet Member Technical Services:

- i) notes the report; and
- ii) recommends that Cabinet approves the funding proposals included in the report, including the Council's contribution for submission to the Department for Transport as the 'best and final funding bid'.

Cabinet

- i) notes the report; and
- ii) approves the funding proposals outlined in the report, including the Council's contribution, to be submitted to the Department for Transport as the Council's 'best and final funding bid' for apportioning funding commitment for the scheme.

This page is intentionally left blank

| LOCAL AUTHORITY MAJOR SCHEMES BEST AND FINAL FUNDING BID | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Scheme Name | Thornton to Switch Island Link |
| Local Authority | Sefton MBC |

Agenda Item 12

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| SECTION 1: THE SCHEME AS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED | |
| <i>This section should describe the scheme as approved at Programme Entry. Please state separately if there have been any subsequent changes previously notified to or discussed with DfT prior to June 2010.</i> | |
| Date of Programme Entry | 15 September 2008 |
| Estimated total scheme cost (inclusive of eligible preparatory costs) | £17.351m |
| DfT contribution | £15.616m |
| Local Authority Contribution | £1.73m |
| Third party contribution | £nil |
| 1.1 Description of the scheme <i>This should clearly state the scope of the scheme and describe all of its key components</i> | |
| <p>The proposed Thornton to Switch Island Link is located in the Borough of Sefton on Merseyside (see attached plan). The scheme comprises a single carriageway link road, approximately 4.3 kilometres in length between the A565 Southport Road, Thornton at the westerly end and the M57, M58, A59 and A5036 Switch Island junction at the eastern end, by-passing the residential communities of Thornton and Netherton (see attached plans).</p> <p>The route will be constructed as a 10 metres wide, two lane, single carriageway with 1m wide hardstrips and a 2.5 metre wide verge. It has been designed assuming a speed limit of 50mph. The road will have some sections on low embankment and others in shallow cutting where it runs close to existing residential properties, but will mostly be close to existing ground level. Surface drainage of the highway will be collected by a kerb and gully system and discharged via verge piped drainage systems, silt traps and oil interceptors to four new attenuation ponds, and subsequently into existing drainage ditches. There are no proposed bridges or retaining structures to be incorporated along the route, other than piped culverts under the route.</p> <p>The route will only be lit where there are specific safety reasons for doing so, which is mainly associated with the junctions and crossings along the route. It is not proposed that there will be any footways along the route other than locally to specific pedestrian crossing points. It is proposed that there are two signal controlled pedestrian crossings at Chapel Lane and at Holgate. Two bus lay-bys are to be incorporated on the link near the junction with Long Lane to replace existing stops on Southport Road.</p> <p>From the western end, the link road alignment commences near the junction of Southport Road / Long Lane / Ince Road, with a new junction arrangement allowing all turning movements. The route will be linked to the existing highway of Park View by a spur link to a new roundabout junction. A new traffic signal controlled junction will be constructed where the route crosses Brickwall Lane (B5422). The junction will incorporate additional lanes on each approach arm to accommodate turning traffic and the traffic signals will include a pedestrian phase to enable people to cross the road safely. There will be another traffic signal controlled junction at Chapel Lane to permit access to Brook House Farm on the north side of the link road. There will be no access to the new link from Chapel Lane on the south side of the link.</p> <p>At its eastern end, the link road will be connected to the traffic signal controlled Switch Island junction. This will involve a modification of the layout of the junction on the west side to incorporate west bound access to the link road from the south end of Switch Island, and eastbound flow from the link road into Switch Island at the north end of the junction. These arrangements have been discussed with the Highways Agency. The movements of traffic</p> | |

entering and leaving the new link road and the implications for Switch Island have been modelled and the results have been assessed by the Highways Agency and their consultants and they are satisfied that the junction will continue to operate successfully.

One of the key requirements for the scheme was to facilitate the transfer of strategic (through) traffic from the existing highway network but without creating additional highway capacity. To achieve this, it is important that the existing highway network does not provide an alternative through route but serves primarily local traffic and provides better conditions for walking, cycling and public transport. A series of complimentary traffic management measures, therefore, have been developed for the existing highway network, specifically Lydiate Lane and the Northern Perimeter Road. They are an important element of the overall scheme and have been included in the traffic modelling and considered in the assessment of the transport impacts of the scheme.

1.2 What are the primary objectives of the scheme?

Please limit this to the primary objectives (ideally no more than 3) such as reducing congestion; the problems to which this scheme is the solution. Do not include secondary objectives i.e. things that the scheme will contribute to (for example it may be an objective of a new road scheme to include improved facilities for cyclists, but that is not a primary objective)

- Relieve congestion on the local highway network in the Thornton to Switch Island corridor, providing a more direct alternative route for strategic traffic, thereby reducing delays and improving journey times.
- Improve strategic highway access between the northwest's motorway system and Southport, the Port of Liverpool and the Atlantic Gateway Strategic Investment Area, providing more reliable journey times and reduced delays to strategic traffic.
- Provide improvements in local environmental quality, access and safety for the local communities of Netherton, Thornton and the Sefton villages.

1.3 Has the total estimated cost of the scheme changed since the award of Programme Entry as stated above?

If yes please provide the latest cost of the scheme with a summary and explanation of the key changes from the cost breakdown provided in the Programme Entry MSBC. Please use this section to identify any cost savings that you have already made since the award of Programme Entry.

Yes

There have been two significant iterations of the cost estimating process since Programme Entry. The first of these took place during the ECI tendering process, when the potential contractors were asked to prepare a cost estimate as part of the tender. Subsequently, following the development of the design to a stage where the planning application could be submitted, the project team (led by the main contractor) reviewed the costs in order to prepare an initial target cost. The results of this latest review of costs, which was based on prices for Q1 2010, have been used as the latest cost estimate presented below.

This latest cost estimate shows an approximately 17% increase in the total cost of the scheme since Programme Entry. The cost breakdown is presented below and a discussion of the main changes since Programme Entry is also provided as an explanation of the change in estimated cost. **Please note that these are the estimated costs before the identification of any potential savings, which are presented in Section 2.3.**

Agenda Item 12

Preparatory Costs (Eligible only)

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Phase 1a (Preliminary Design, Environmental Assessment, Planning Application) | £1.492m** |
| Phase 1b (Statutory Processes, Detailed Design) | £1.083m |
| Construction Costs (including supervision) | £14.044m |
| Statutory Undertakers' Diversions | £0.720m |
| Risk | £1.685m |
| Inflation | £1.254m |
| Eligible Scheme Costs | <u>£20.278m</u> |
| Ineligible Preparation Costs | £0.200m |
| Land | £0.500m |
| Total Scheme Cost Estimate (June 2010) | <u>£20.978m</u> |

*** The Phase 1a costs given here are actual costs already expended up to the submission of the planning application in July 2010.*

Phase 1a – There has been a significant increase in the preparatory costs as part of Phase 1a of the ECI contract compared to the expected preparatory costs identified in the Programme Entry budget. This has mainly been due to the extent of work undertaken on the scheme design, environmental assessment and planning application. For example, approximately £190,000 was spent on finalising the planning application in taking Counsel advice about the submission and amending the documentation to take account of the advice received. This work was considered important and appropriate because of the effect on the likelihood of a Public Inquiry on planning issues. It is hoped that the impact of this work will be to reduce or even avoid the need for a Public Inquiry, which would offer significant benefits both in costs and programme.

Phase 1b – There has also been an increase in the preparatory costs anticipated for Phase 1b. This is based on the contractor's estimate based on a better understanding of the scheme and what is required. However, the main aspect of the change in this element is the transfer of the costs of detailed design from the Construction phase (where it was included at Programme Entry stage) into Phase 1b. This is primarily a programming issue to enable the more efficient and effective delivery of the scheme and is mainly simply a transfer of costs rather than an increase in the estimate.

Construction – There is a significant increase in the cost estimate for the construction phase (from £9.999m at Programme Entry to £14.044m in the current estimate). Despite the transfer of Detailed Design costs, the Construction cost estimate has increased substantially. This is largely due to pricing factors and inflation. The Programme Entry estimates were based on 2005 prices and consequently attracted a high level of inflation (£4.505m at Programme Entry). The latest estimate is based on 2010 prices and, as a

result, inflation estimates have reduced to £1.254m. This difference in price rates and inflation accounts for much of the change in construction cost estimates (about 75%), although there have been other factors that have also changed and have made up the other 25% of the increase.

The need to include the works on the VOSA site (see 2.1 below) has added at least £180,000 to the construction costs. The development of the scheme design has also identified additional construction costs. In particular, for example, the latest estimate for the required environmental and landscape mitigation measures is approximately £200,000 more than had been allowed for in the Programme Entry estimate.

Statutory Undertakers' Diversions – The estimate for diversions of electricity, gas and telecommunications infrastructure has increased significantly since Programme Entry (from £370,000 to £720,000). This based on a combination of the initial estimates received from the utility companies and an analysis by the project team of the realistic costs that might be required (i.e. the utility company estimates are much higher than the amount currently included in the cost estimate). The need for works on the VOSA site also requires additional diversions, substantially contributing to the increased costs for diversion works.

Risk – The scheme risk register has been reviewed and updated on a regular basis during the project. The allocation for risk has remained similar to that proposed at Programme Entry.

Inflation – As described above, the amount identified for inflation is now substantially less because 2010 prices have been used for the latest estimate, rather than 2005 prices as used in the Programme Entry estimate.

In order to provide an overall estimate of the total scheme cost, the ineligible preparation costs and land costs have also been identified. Land costs were not included in the Programme Entry submission and have therefore been kept separate from the other scheme costs.

It is acknowledged and accepted that the Additional Risk Layer cost sharing mechanism has been discontinued. However, if the reduced percentage of 'optimism bias' that would have applied at the previous Conditional Appraisal application was applied to the current cost estimate, the current total scheme cost (including an additional risk layer) would remain very similar to the Programme Entry estimate incorporating the additional risk layer. This means that elements of the additional contingency provided by the additional risk layer have largely been incorporated into the initial target cost, whether in cost expended or in better developed and more up to date cost estimates.

Agenda Item 12

SECTION 2: REVISED SCHEME PROPOSAL

This section should describe the changes you are proposing to make for the purposes of your Best and Final Funding Bid as described in the DfT document "Investment in Local Major Transport Schemes" published on 26 October

2.1 Are you proposing any changes of scope from the scheme as described in Section 1 above

If yes, please describe in detail the changes you are proposing and revised cost breakdown with a read-across from the costs set out in the Programme Entry MSBC (or the latest cost estimate at 1.3 above). Please also attach explanatory maps, diagrams etc. as appropriate.

The new links to Switch Island will also require amendments to the area of the site presently occupied by the Vehicle Operators Service Agency (VOSA). The details of these requirements had not been defined at the time of Programme Entry. As part of the design work undertaken in preparing the planning application, a proposed site layout was developed based on other existing VOSA sites. The proposed layout was discussed and agreed with VOSA. Plans are attached as requested.

All the existing features of the site will be relocated within a revised layout, contained within the area bounded by Switch Island and the two sections of the new link road. Details are shown on the accompanying plans. The estimated costs of the proposed works amount to £180,000, which have been incorporated into the scheme costs. Details of these costs were not available at the time of programme entry and although an allowance was included in the cost estimate, it was included within the risk allocation and not identified separately.

The proposed new layout of the VOSA facility has also had some implications for statutory undertakers' diversions as it is likely that an electricity cable will require diversion to accommodate the reconfigured VOSA site. This has contributed to the anticipated increase in utility diversion costs for the scheme.

2.2 What, if any, additional changes of scope have you ruled out for the purposes of your Best and Final Funding Bid? Please give reasons

The detailed and rigorous option appraisal process that was used to identify the proposed route ensured that the best option for achieving the scheme objectives was selected. The basis of the option appraisal has been reviewed and is considered to still be relevant and appropriate. The potential for changing the scope of the scheme is very limited, without compromising the achievement of the objectives. The route selected is the best route to achieve the objectives and revisions to the route alignment would not be either appropriate or practical. In engineering terms, the scheme is straightforward and there are no components of the scheme that can be either removed or amended. Consequently, there are no other proposals for any changes in the scope of the project.

2.3 Whether or not you are not proposing a change of scope, please identify any savings that can be made to the total cost of the scheme, for example through value engineering?

Please provide details with a summary and explanation of the further savings beyond those already identified at 2.1 above or, if no scope changes are proposed, with reference to the cost breakdown provided in the Programme Entry MSBC (or the latest cost estimate at 1.3 above)

As part of the process of preparing this Best and Final Funding Bid, the scheme costs have been reviewed to identify the potential for savings for the scheme. All stages of the project

have been examined to identify opportunities for efficiencies and savings, including a review and update of the risk register. Overall, the potential for major value engineering measures is limited because of the scope of the scheme. It is a relatively simple scheme, with no major structures or other features that could be redesigned or delivered in a different way. Nevertheless, some potential has been identified and has been incorporated into a revised cost update. The opportunities for savings in the scheme budget are identified below and discussed in detail in subsequent paragraphs.

| | Cost saving | Revised total |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Preparatory Costs (Eligible only) | | |
| Phase 1a (Preliminary Design, Environmental Assessment, Planning Application) | 0 | £1.492m |
| Phase 1b (Statutory Processes, Detailed Design) | £0.130m | £0.953m |
| Construction Costs (including supervision) | £0.813m | £13.231m |
| Statutory Undertakers' Diversions | 0 | £0.720m |
| Risk | £0.503m | £1.182m |
| Inflation | £0.244m | £1.010m |
| Eligible Scheme Costs | <u>£1.690m</u> | <u>£18.588m</u> |
| Ineligible Preparation Costs | 0 | £0.200m |
| Land | £0.050m | £0.450m |
| Total Scheme Cost Estimate (November 2010) | <u>£1.740m</u> | <u>£19.238m</u> |

Phase 1b – An anticipated saving of £130,000 has been identified. This relates mainly to the costs associated with the re-submission of the business case for the scheme, which will no longer be required (subject to the acceptance of the Best and Final Funding Bid) and the identification of some other savings in consultant fees.

Construction – Opportunities for value engineering and other options for savings during construction have been reviewed. A total of £813,000 saving has been identified. This comprises approximately £455,000 of value engineering and £358,000 of other savings. The value engineering savings consist mainly of a reduction in the amount of lighting required for the scheme and associated electrical supplies, review of required pavement thickness, reduction in temporary fencing, site office arrangements and competitive pricing. Other cost savings were identified in the estimating process and the more efficient integration of site supervision.

Risk – The latest review of the risk register resulted in a reduction of the level of risk in some areas and a resultant saving of about £500,000.

Inflation – Some savings have been identified in inflation through the use of a lower

Agenda Item 12

inflation figure than previously, reflecting the current economic conditions. However, the review of the major scheme programme and the availability of funding only from 2012/13 has extended the potential start date for the scheme and resulted in some additional inflation being applied to the scheme because of the changes in programme. Therefore, the saving in inflation is not as great as might have otherwise been achieved.

Land – The latest land cost estimates indicate that a saving of £50,000 can be made.

SECTION 3: IMPACT OF CHANGES PROPOSED

This section should describe the impact of the changes you are proposing in Section 2 above compared to the previously configured scheme as described in Section 1

3.1 What impact, if any, would the proposed changes have upon achievement of your primary objectives?

All the objectives will still be achieved.

3.2 What impact, if any, would the proposed changes be likely to have on the overall value for money case for the scheme, and in particular on the benefits and costs previously estimated?

Where possible, please provide estimates of what impact each proposed change would have on the costs and benefits of the scheme. This should cover both monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits.

The revised scheme cost estimate identified above (in section 2.3) is very similar to the Investment Cost figure used in the original Benefit Cost assessment presented in the MSBC. This indicates that the PVC used in the Business Case would effectively remain unchanged. The update of the traffic modelling undertaken for the environmental assessment and in response to comments from the DfT at Programme Entry stage indicates that there are no major changes to the expected journey time savings, which provide the scheme benefits, although no new TEE table has been generated at this stage.

The BCR presented in the MSBC, as subsequently amended in response to comments from the DfT appraisal team, therefore remains valid and is not materially changed by the revised scheme costs presented above.

The value for money information and revised BCR prepared by the DfT as part of the spending review has been scrutinised. The spending review adjustments have resulted in a significant increase in the BCR. The scheme already offered excellent value for money, but the revisions mean that the scheme offers exceptional value for money. The main reason for this appears to be the way that indirect tax has been removed from the costs of the scheme. The relative simplicity of the scheme means that it has a low construction cost and removal of the indirect tax reduces the scheme costs by about 60%. When this reduction is combined with an increase in overall scheme benefits due to the reliability and wider impacts contributions, it results in a major change in the BCR. If the changes in indirect tax are not included, there is still an increase in the BCR, but it is much smaller.

The Council has always maintained that the scheme offers significant value for money because it is a relatively simple, low cost scheme that offers substantial journey time savings and with limited environmental impacts. The DfT's review of value for money has confirmed that position and Sefton Council is happy to accept the revised figures.

3.3 What impact, if any, would the proposed changes have on the statutory orders or permissions required or the timetable for obtaining these?

For example would fresh planning consent need to be sought?

No changes to the orders or permissions are required. The planning application for the scheme was submitted in July 2010 and has been ?? by Sefton Council's Planning Committee. The application has been referred to GONW for a decision about whether a Planning Inquiry is required. The Side Roads Order and Compulsory Purchase Order processes will be pursued once acceptance of the BAFFB has been confirmed.

3.4 What impact, if any, would the proposed changes have on the procurement arrangements or timetable?

For example would any retendering be required?

The design and construction contract has already been procured through an Early Contractor Involvement contract and no further procurement will be required.

3.5 What is the estimated start and completion date of the scheme as now proposed, taking into account any of the impacts described above?

For the purposes of this question assume that no DfT funding will be available before 2012/13. Please list all relevant milestones including start and completion of statutory processes, public inquiries, procurement etc.

An outline of key milestones is provided below.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Sefton Planning Committee | Dec 2010 |
| DfT confirmation of BAFFB | Jan 2011 |
| Publish draft Orders (SRO, CPO) | Feb 2011 |
| SoS decision on need for planning PI | Feb 2011 |
| SoS decision on need for Orders PI | June 2011 |
| Public Inquiry | Nov 2011 |
| SoS Decision | March 2012 |
| Construction start | Sept 2012 |
| Construction complete | Sept 2013 |

Agenda Item 12

| SECTION 4: FUNDING | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|----------------|
| <i>This section is to detail the cost and funding for your revised proposal as described in Section 2 above. Please quote all amounts in £m to three decimal points (i.e. to the nearest £1000)</i> | | | | | | |
| 4.1 What is your estimate of the total outturn cost of the scheme? <i>After taking into account all the proposed changes described in Section 2 above.</i> | | | | | £18.588m (excludes land and ineligible preparatory costs) | |
| 4.2 Please state what inflation assumption you are using? | | | | | 2.7% pa | |
| 4.3 Please provide a breakdown of the proposed funding sources for the scheme | | | | | | |
| (a) Local Authority contribution <i>This needs to cover the difference between the total cost of the scheme as stated above and the total of the requested DfT and agreed third party contributions.</i> | | | | | £4.088m | |
| (b) Agreed third party contributions <i>Please name each contributor on a separate line and provide evidence of agreement (e.g. a letter from the funder outlining the degree of commitment, timing for release of funds and any other conditions etc).</i> | | | | | Nil | |
| (c) DfT funding requested <i>You are reminded that, as set out in the document "Investment in Local Major Transport Schemes" the risk layer cost sharing mechanism is being discontinued and the figure you enter here will, if accepted, be the maximum funding that DfT will provide for the scheme. If you wish eligible preparatory costs (as defined by previous guidance) to be paid these will need to be consolidated within this funding request.</i> | | | | | £14.500m | |
| 4.4 What is the estimated funding profile? <i>Assume that no DfT funding will be available before 2012/13 Please specify the third party contributor(s) and list each one (if more than one) on a separate line.</i> | | | | | | |
| | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 |
| LA contribution | £1.492m | £0.518m | £0.398m | £1.530m | £0.150m | |
| Third Party contribution | | | | | | |
| DfT funding requested | | | £7.000m | £7.500m | | |
| Total (excluding land and ineligible prep costs) | £1.492m | £0.518m | £7.398m | £9.030m | £0.150m | |
| Breakdown by stage | | | | | | |
| Phase 1a | £1.492m | | | | | |
| Phase 1b | | £0.370m | £0.583m | | | |
| Construction | | | £5.232m | £7.849m | £0.150m | |
| Stats diversions | | | £0.720m | | | |
| Risk | | £0.118m | £0.473m | £0.591m | | |
| Inflation | | £0.030m | £0.390m | £0.590m | | |
| Total Eligible Scheme Cost | £1.492m | £0.518m | £7.398m | £9.030m | £0.150m | |
| Ineligible Prep Costs | £0.100m | £0.100m | | | | |
| Land | | | £0.450m | | | |
| TOTAL | £1.592m | £0.618m | £7.848m | £9.030m | £0.150m | |

SECTION 5: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please add any additional information that is relevant to your Best and Final Funding Bid that is not covered elsewhere in the form

The public and political support for the delivery of the Thornton to Switch Island Link remains very high. The response to the Government's announcement that the scheme was being included in the Supported Pool was overwhelmingly positive. There is cross party support for the scheme within Sefton Council and the authority's commitment to delivering the scheme is demonstrated by the saving it is offering to the DfT and its own increased contribution.

The Council's commitment to the scheme is also demonstrated by the decision to proceed with the planning application during the major scheme review. The inclusion of the scheme in the Supported Pool has vindicated that decision and also enabled the Council to be in a position to react quickly to the opportunity to proceed with the scheme.

The scheme is not complex, it has no major engineering or environmental constraints and the structures are in place in the project team to enable delivery of the scheme as soon as the statutory processes have been completed. The contractor/designer team have been working with the Council and its consultants for 17 months and are well placed to deliver the scheme.

The scheme programme and cost estimates include an assumption that a Public Inquiry will be required, whether for planning issues or the Orders. However, the project team has invested considerable time and effort in trying to reduce the potential for a Public Inquiry. If there is no requirement for a Public Inquiry, there is the potential to bring forward the start of construction for the scheme by about 7-8 months, possibly to Jan/Feb 2012. This has benefits both for the overall scheme cost and the delivery programme. However, it would also affect the project spend profile and profile of the DfT contribution, resulting in a greater proportion of the contribution being required in 2012/13.

The potential for an earlier delivery of the scheme is identified at this stage so that the DfT can consider the implications for the profile of their contribution. Subject to the acceptance of the BAFFB, the project team will advise the DfT of any significant decisions that may influence the delivery programme.

Agenda Item 12

SECTION 151 OFFICER DECLARATION

As Section 151 Officer for Sefton Council I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that Sefton Council has the intention and the means to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution at section 4.3 (a) above, on the understanding that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested at 4.3 (c).

Name:

Mike Martin

Signed:

SENIOR RESPONSIBLE OWNER DECLARATION

As Senior Responsible Owner for Thornton to Switch Island Link, I hereby submit this Best and Final Funding Bid to DfT on behalf of Sefton Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

Name:

Stuart Waldron

Signed:

Position:

Assistant Director
Transportation and Development

CONTACT DETAILS FOR FURTHER ENQUIRIES

Lead Contact:

Position:

Tel:

E-mail:

Stephen Birch

Team Leader, Strategic Transportation Planning Unit

0151 934 4225

Stephen.birch@sefton.gov.uk

Alternative Contact:

Position:

Tel:

E-mail:

Colin Jolliffe

Project Leader, Capita Symonds

0151 934 4244

Colin.jolliffe@capita.co.uk

Agenda Item 13

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member Technical Services
Cabinet

DATE: 15th December 2010
16th December 2010

SUBJECT: Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Service (MELS)

**WARDS
AFFECTED:** All

REPORT OF: Andy Wallis Planning & Economic Regeneration Director

**CONTACT
OFFICER:** Stuart Waldron Assistant Director Transport & Spatial Planning
0151 934 4006
Jerry McConkey Network Manager
0151 934 4222

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

To appraise Members of the current situation with regard to the support and funding for the Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Service (MELS) for which Sefton Council is the lead authority and accountable body on behalf of the five Merseyside Districts. The report highlights the current and future budget situation that impacts on the viability of this Business Unit and hence staff resources.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

Sefton Council act as lead authority and accountable body for the Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Service within the terms of a formal Agreement governing the service. Reduced demand for the service, due to the current financial situation, has resulted in a need to review the viability of this Business Unit. The Council as lead authority needs to approve and implement the outcome of the review, in consultation with the District Partners.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

It is recommend that Cabinet Member Technical Services recommends to Cabinet

1. The Merseyside Districts Authorities view that sufficient funding and hence commissions will not be available in the foreseeable future to maintain the Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Services as a viable Business Unit be noted.
2. In accordance with the Service Agreement with the Merseyside Districts Authorities the withdrawal of Sefton Council's consent to act as Designated

Agenda Item 13

Council and the termination of the MELS Agreement be approved.

3. That officers continue to seek the full co-operation of the partner District Authorities to seek redeployment of the staff and to explore opportunities for the potential future utilisation of these specialist skills and equipment, including by private sector interests.

Note that this will involve a reduction in staff, to be achieved through the Council's normal personnel procedures and if necessary compulsory redundancies. Under the terms of the Agreement all the Merseyside District Authorities will be responsible for considering redeployment opportunities and to share any costs.

KEY DECISION: No

FORWARD PLAN: No

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the expiry of the 'call in' period for the minutes of the meeting.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

The current joint Agreement for the service permits one of the other constituent authorities to take over the responsibilities of Designated Council and become the accountable body for the service. All four districts have been consulted and all have indicated they do not wish to pursue this course of action.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: The service currently places demands on the Aids to Movement Budget within the Technical Services Portfolio with regard to the council's contribution to a 'core' fee (£15k/yr) and to cover any annual deficit in the budget after fees from commissions are taken into account.

Financial:

| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | 2006/ 2007 £ | 2007/ 2008 £ | 2008/ 2009 £ | 2009/ 2010 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | | | | |
| Specific Capital Resources | | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | | | | |
| Funded by: | | | | |
| Sefton funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal:

The terms and conditions of the Legal Agreement between the Constituent Authorities have been considered in compiling this report.

Risk Assessment:

Asset Management:

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

FD573 The Interim Head of Corporate Finance & Information Services has been consulted and has no comments on this report.

LEGAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Agenda Item 13

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | | √ | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | | √ |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | | √ |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | | | √ |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | | √ |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | | √ | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | | | √ |
| 8 | Children and Young People | | √ | |

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

The Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Services Agreement of January 1992, amended in November 1994.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The establishment of a Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Service (MELS) dates back to the former County Council, and on abolition Sefton Council became the lead authority and accountable body.
- 1.2 A formal Agreement was signed on the 22nd January 1992 by the five Merseyside District Authorities (Sefton, St Helens, Wirral, Liverpool and Knowsley) to formally establish management and accountability responsibilities, including details of how the constituent authorities may withdraw from the Agreement. A supplementary Agreement was signed on the 7th November 1994 amending the period of notice for a Constituent Authority to withdraw from 12 months to 3 months.
- 1.3 Within the terms of the Agreement, as lead authority and accountable body Sefton Council became 'the Designated Authority', the other four district authorities being referred to as 'Constituent Authorities'.
- 1.4 As a consequence the Council operate a Business Unit on behalf of the Merseyside Districts. It is intended that the service shall be non-profit making and self financing with the charge for each element of the service being derived from and assessment of the costs involved.
- 1.5 The services provided by MELS include:
 - Highways and geotechnical laboratory services
 - Materials testing/failure analysis
 - Site investigations
 - Road condition surveys
 - Technical/policy support
 - Project management support
 - Research/innovation support and advice.
- 1.6 The service employs 9.5 fte staff and is based in the Cambridge Road Depot in Seaforth.

The Constituent Authorities undertake to use their best endeavours to make the fullest possible use of the Laboratory Service to satisfy their particular needs.

The operational budget is circa £600,000 per year. To fund this the 5 Districts are charged a core fee totalling £78k per year (Sefton - £15k / yr), the remaining funding coming from fees for individual work commissions. These commissions are mainly by the five Merseyside Districts, but work from other neighbouring authorities has been undertaken.

Typically over recent years departments within Sefton Council have commissioned over 40% of the value of commercial works delivered i.e. relating to Highway Maintenance and Improvement Schemes, monitoring third

Agenda Item 13

party works within the highway and property and architectural services projects. Forecasting for all these areas of work indicate substantial reductions in funding and even cessation of programmes. In addition to maximise what can be achieved with available funding the scope and scale of services currently sought relating to material testing and surveys will be reduced.

- 1.7 Any deficit in the annual account results in a supplementary invoice to the Constituent Authorities in accordance with the population based distribution formula.

2.0 Service Review

- 2.1 Over recent financial years the volume of commissions placed by the Constituent Authorities has declined.

- 2.2 In the current financial conditions with substantially reduced capital and revenue budgets for maintenance and new improvement schemes the potential to grow and develop the business has become extremely difficult to achieve. All the Constituent Authorities have confirmed this position.

- 2.3 Efforts have been made to find new initiatives to support the business, including work to monitor the standard of statutory undertakers' reinstatements, and seek replacement as appropriate. However, this approach requires significant management and administrative time from core partner resources that all districts report as being under pressure. Commissions from other authorities have also been sought but again opportunities are becoming increasingly limited.

- 2.4 The Constituent Authorities are all concerned about the increasing demand to cover deficits in the operational budget from revenue budgets at a time when substantial cuts are under consideration. As a consequence the future of the service has been reviewed and the following options considered:

- i) New Agreement with financial arrangements that guarantee sufficient work to provide a Balanced Account.

All districts have indicated they could not sign up to a commitment that provides a guaranteed level of work.

- ii) Externalise the Services with existing Private Sector Partner or to the Open Market.

A number of the Constituent Authorities have arrangements in place with private sector companies providing services that link into those provided by MELS.

Assessments of this option would indicate complex legal and financial issues, and private sector partners requiring exclusivity of use and possibly mandatory buy in to services.

The Constituent Authorities have indicated that they would not be in a position to sign up to such agreements, and in addition significant liabilities would be retained, particularly on the lead authority.

iii) Closure of the Service

The scope and scale of demand for the MELS services by each Constituent Authority will be substantially reduced due to greatly reduced capital and revenue budgets from 2011/12 onwards. As a consequence, it is considered a viable service cannot be maintained at current resource levels. Options to reduce resource levels have been considered but to be viable a range of services would still need to be available that could be difficult to achieve, and furthermore the level of on-costs associated with the service will become disproportionately high significantly affecting the value for money provided.

2.5 Directing Group Recommendation

The MELS Agreement established a Directing Group to manage the service comprising Chief Officers or nominees from the five Merseyside Districts as Constituent Authorities.

The Directing Group has considered in detail the review of the service and concluded that a viable Business Unit cannot be maintained and hence the service should be discontinued in its present form.

Assessments of the options to sell or externalise the service in its current form would indicate it is not a commercially viable proposition and substantial alterations to operating practice and resources would be required.

3.0 Proposal

3.1 As Designated Council, the Agreement places increased liabilities on Sefton Council as lead authority and accountable body. The impacts on revenue budgets with no return on expenditure are unsustainable. As a consequence it is recommended that taking the views of the Constituent Authorities through the Directing Group into account, the Council take the lead and give notice to withdraw its consent to be the Designated Council and to terminate the Agreement.

3.2 Procedure for Termination

In accordance with the Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Services Agreement of January 1992, amended in November 1994, the following clauses are relevant to the proposed termination of the Agreement:

- i) The Constituent Authorities must give not less than three months notice of termination.

Agenda Item 13

- ii) The Designated Council (Sefton Council) may give notice unto itself.
- iii) The Designated Council may give not less than three months notice to the Constituent Authorities to withdraw its consent to act as Designated Council. In this event the Agreement will terminate when withdrawal takes effect unless the Constituent Authorities have agreed another Council will be the Designated Council.
- iv) with regard to terminating the Agreement the Constituent Authorities responsibilities will be:
 - In the event that the service shall be discontinued the Constituent Authorities shall share in equal proportion the cost of such discontinuance account being taken of the cost of any redeployment of staff undertaken by the Constituent Authorities.
 - The Constituent Authorities will use their best endeavours to redeploy the staff appointed to the service within their own establishments.
 - The Constituent Authorities shall pay a proportion of all other outstanding debts such proportion being related to the respective populations of the Constituent Authorities.

3.3 The Director of Planning and Economic Development as Sefton's representative on the Directing Group has requested each of the Constituent Authorities to advise if Sefton withdraw as Designated Council if their authority would wish to take over this position as permitted in the Agreement. The other four Merseyside District Authorities have confirmed they would not wish to become the Designated Authority

3.4 It is therefore proposed that:

Sefton gives notice that it withdraws its consent to act as Designated Council – Clause 10(1) – 1992 Agreement as amended by Clause 2 of the 1994 Agreement

Sefton gives notice to terminate the Agreement – Clause 2(1) – 1992 Agreement as amended by Clause 1 of the 1994 Agreement.

3.5 If approved it is proposed to give formal notification of these actions on the 31st December 2010 to become effective on the 31st March 2011.

3.6 The Council will have to issue statutory notices to the staff on the 31st December 2010, to permit termination of employment on the 31st March 2011.

The reduction in staff will be achieved through the Council's normal personnel procedures and if necessary compulsory redundancies. Under the terms of the Agreement all the Merseyside District Constituent Authorities will be responsible for considering redeployment opportunities and to share the costs.

4.0 External Mitigation

- 4.1 The demand for the services provided by MELS is required on a commercial basis on a geographically wider and more focused basis than the MELS Agreement would permit to be considered.
- 4.2 There may be an opportunity for the private sector to utilise the expertise and skills of the MELS staff to establish a fully commercial private sector venture. Furthermore the Council will have equipment for disposal and a vacant facility to manage. Should such interest come forward the Council will seek to co-operate opportunities to mitigate the impact of the service termination.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 The Directing Group of representatives from the five Merseyside District Constituent Authorities stressed that concluding that the service viability can no longer be maintained, was not a reflection of the excellent service provided by MELS over many years.
- 5.2 As Designated Council it is correct that the Council in partnership with the Constituent Authorities should take the lead in managing the way forward.
- 5.3 The proposed termination of the Agreement is considered the appropriate way forward to reduce unsustainable demands on revenue budgets.

6.0 Recommendation

It is recommend that Cabinet Member Technical Services recommends to Cabinet

- (i) The Merseyside Districts Authorities view that sufficient funding and hence commissions will not be available in the foreseeable future to maintain the Merseyside Engineers Laboratory Services as a viable Business Unit be noted.
- (ii) In accordance with the Service Agreement with the Merseyside Districts Authorities the withdrawal of Sefton Council's consent to act as Designated Council and the termination of the MELS Agreement be approved.

Note that this will involve a reduction in staff, to be achieved through the Council's normal personnel procedures and if necessary compulsory redundancies. Under the terms of the Agreement all the Merseyside District Authorities will be responsible for considering redeployment opportunities and to share any costs.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 14

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member - Leisure and Tourism
Cabinet

DATE: 1st December 2010
16th December 2010

SUBJECT: Proposals for the Creation of a Single Registration Service
for Births, Deaths and Marriages for Sefton

WARDS AFFECTED: All Wards

REPORT OF: Leisure And Tourism Director - G Bayliss

CONTACT OFFICER: Rajan Paul Assistant Leisure and Tourism Director (Proper
Officer) 0151 934 2377
John Proffitt, Head of Cemeteries and Crematoria, Registrars
and Coroners - 0151 934 2357

EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL: NO

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

To seek approval for the introduction of a Single Registration Service of Births Deaths and Marriages for Sefton

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

This is a policy decision which requires Cabinet Member and Cabinet approval

RECOMMENDATION(S):

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Tourism recommends to Cabinet that they :

- i. Approve, in principle, the introduction of a single registration service for Sefton
- ii. Approve, in principle, the adoption of 'New Governance' a General Register Office initiative in order to facilitate the single registration district and reduce regulation.

It is recommended that Cabinet

- i. Approve, in principle, the introduction of a single registration service for Sefton
- ii. Approve, in principle, the adoption of 'New Governance' a General Register Office initiative in order to facilitate the single registration district and reduce regulation.
- iii. Notes that due to Government regulation the introduction of a single registration district and adoption of 'New Governance' are subject to final approval by the Registrar General.
- iv. Authorises the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Tourism and Sefton's Proper Officer for the Registration Service to progress matters with the General Registry Office in order to bring these proposals into effect.

KEY DECISION: No

FORWARD PLAN: No

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Upon the expiry of the Call in period following the publication of the Cabinet Minutes

Agenda Item 14

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

- To retain the two districts

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework:

| Financial: | 2009/ 2010 £ | 2010/ 2010 £ | 2011/ 2012 £ | 2012/ 2013 £ |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Funded by: | 0 | | | |
| Sefton Capital Resources | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Specific Capital Resources | 0 | | | |
| <u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u> | | | | |
| Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure | 0 | | | |
| Funded by: | 0 | | | |
| Sefton funded Resources | | | | |
| Funded from External Resources | | | | |
| Does the External Funding have an expiry date? N | When? | | | |
| How will the service be funded post expiry? | | | | |

Legal: This is a statutory Service

Risk Assessment: None

Asset Management: None

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

| <u>Corporate Objective</u> | | <u>Positive Impact</u> | <u>Neutral Impact</u> | <u>Negative Impact</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Creating a Learning Community | | ✓ | |
| 2 | Creating Safe Communities | | ✓ | |
| 3 | Jobs and Prosperity | | ✓ | |
| 4 | Improving Health and Well-Being | | ✓ | |
| 5 | Environmental Sustainability | | ✓ | |
| 6 | Creating Inclusive Communities | ✓ | | |
| 7 | Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy | ✓ | | |
| 8 | Children and Young People | | ✓ | |

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Sefton Births Deaths and Marriages Registration Service is a statutory function which is regulated by the Government via the General Registry Office (GRO) but provided and funded by the Local Authority.
- 1.2 Legislation places a duty on the Local Authority to provide the service and specifies minimum standards in terms of its provision. Details of how each individual Authority will meet these have to be proposed, in a document known as a 'Scheme', to the Registrar General (RG) for their approval.
- 1.3 Sefton's current scheme, which dates back to 1989, identifies two independent registration districts and offices, based on the ward boundaries. As far as legislative requirements and the GRO are concerned these are two completely separate districts and have to be staffed and managed accordingly.

Sefton North Registration district based at Southport Town Hall covers Cambridge, Meols, Dukes, Norwood, Kew, Birkdale, Ainsdale, Harington, Ravenmeols

Sefton South Registration district based at Waterloo Town hall covers Manor, Blundellsands, Victoria, Church, Linacre, Derby, Litherland, Ford, St Oswald Netherton and Orrell, Molyneux, Sudell, Park

- 1.4 The difficulties with this type of scheme is its inflexibility, even a minor change e.g. amending opening hours requires RG approval. This restricts our service provision and means that it is difficult to adapt if service users needs change.
- 1.5 GRO have recognised the difficulties that this level of regulation can cause for local registration services and over the past two years have introduced an alternative to the Scheme known as New Governance.
- 1.6 This initiative allows greater flexibility and reduced regulation, passing more of the regulatory responsibility down to the local level and away from the GRO. It also permits changes to the service without the need to have RG approval first.
- 1.7 At least 100 of the 174 local authorities in England have already adopted New Governance and are already seeing the benefits of reduced regulation.
- 1.8 One of the other issues with Sefton's current scheme are the two independent districts which can cause difficulties for residents; details are highlighted below.

2.0 Difficulties Created by the Current Two District Setup

- 2.1 Having two independent registration districts in Sefton creates difficulties for residents. The reason for this is that births deaths and marriages must, by law, be registered in the registration district where the person lives. As Sefton is split into two districts, north and south, based on ward boundaries, certain residents have to travel further than necessary.
- 2.2 This can also create difficulties, depending upon where people work e.g a person living in Southport but working in Bootle would have to register in Southport despite the south office at Waterloo being closer.
- 2.3 Both districts operate an appointment system for registrations, at certain times of the year. Due to the volume of work, the offices have difficulty providing sufficient registration appointment slots. But as mentioned above due to the districts being independent a resident can't use another office as it is outside of the district. e.g. if the north office is fully booked on a particular day, but the south office has free appointment times, it is not possible for resident to attend the south office (as it is outside the area) and the person would have to wait for another day.

Agenda Item 14

2.4 The current set up also means that staffing both offices can be difficult. It is a statutory requirement to have an appointed Superintendent Registrar and a Registrar for Births Deaths and Marriages for each district. This means that there is no possibility of moving or adjusting staffing levels and if not fully utilised they still need to be provided.

3.0 Service Improvements

3.1 **Adopting New Governance**

3.11 As mentioned previously the GRO recommends the adoption of New Governance as an alternative to the current schemes. Adopting this initiative will have a number of advantages for Sefton and its residents including;

- Regulation by the GRO is reduced
- Greater freedom and flexibility to tailor the delivery of the local Registration Service
- The Proper Officer (Currently the Assistant Leisure and Tourism Director) is given more responsibility and accountability for the delivery of the service
- A 'Light Touch' inspection regime by the GRO is introduced
- Ability to amend the Registration Service, including changes to staffing and offices without the need to refer to the GRO for approval
- The Registration Service is brought into line with other Council services, meaning that members and officers can decide how the service is provided and not the GRO.

3.2 **Creating a Single Registration District**

3.21 The GRO recommend that where local authorities have more than one registration district, as part of adopting New Governance, they consider creating a single registration district.

3.22 In Sefton's case there would be a number of advantages for residents in doing this including;

- Ward boundary restrictions would be removed
- Residents would be able to chose which office to register at
- Increased availability of appointment times as they could use both offices
- Staff could be transferred between offices if required
- Only one main office will be needed, giving greater flexibility in terms of 'outstation' delivery e.g. at a different venue on different days
- There would only be a need to provide two statutory officers - Superintendent and Registrar of Births Deaths and Marriages - instead of the four currently required which gives greater flexibility for future staff provision

4.0 The Process

4.1 The creation of a single registration district and adoption of New Governance has a number of key requirements. Work has already commenced on some of these as part of the general management of the service these include.

4.2

| Task | Target Date |
|--|-----------------------|
| Preliminary discussions with GRO | Nov 2010 (completed) |
| Implementing a system for the Control of Certificate Stock | Nov 2010 (completed) |
| Production of a Service Delivery Plan | Nov 2010 (completed) |
| Incorporate Performance Management and GRO Performance Indicators | Nov 2010 (completed) |
| Members agreement to the principle of a single registration District | Dec 2010 |

Agenda Item 14

| | |
|---|------------|
| Formal Commitment to by the Proper Officer to The GRO new Governance Code Of Practice and Submission of GRO questionnaire | Dec 2010 |
| Discussions with staff | Jan 2011 |
| Detailed discussions with GRO | Feb 2011 |
| Proper Officer Submission to GRO for approval | April 2011 |
| Introduction of new Births Deaths and Marriages District and New Governance | July 2011 |

5.0 Final Approval of the Proposals

- 5.1 The Cabinet Member and Cabinet should note that that this report seeks approval in principle, for the adoption of New Governance and the Creation of a Single Registration District.
- 5.2 Due to the statutory nature of the service, Members should note that final approval for implementation of these initiatives falls to the Registrar General.
- 5.3 If the principle is approved by Members, the final submission will be made by Sefton's Proper Officer for Registration Service, after approval by the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Tourism.

6.0 Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications and in fact allowing greater flexibility of staffing and sites may mean that some efficiencies and savings can be identified.

7.0 Conclusions

- 7.1 Introduction of a single Registration Service will have a number of advantages for Sefton residents and the Council as a whole and will result in greater flexibility, reduced regulation by the GRO and an ability to tailor the Registration Service to the Council's particular needs.

8.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Tourism recommends to Cabinet that they :

1. Approve, in principle, the introduction of a single registration service for Sefton
2. Approve, in principle, the adoption of 'New Governance' a General Registry Office initiative in order to facilitate the single registration district and reduce regulation.

It is recommended that Cabinet

1. Approve, in principle, the introduction of a single registration service for Sefton.
2. Approve, in principle, the adoption of 'New Governance' a General Registry Office initiative in order to facilitate the single registration district and reduce regulation.
3. Note that due to Government regulation the introduction of a single registration district and adoption of 'New Governance' are subject to final approval by the Registrar General.
4. Authorises the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Tourism and Sefton's Proper Officer for the Registration Service to progress matters with the General Registry Office in order to bring these proposals into effect.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 16 DECEMBER 2010

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SOUTHPORT AREA COMMITTEE – 17 NOVEMBER 2010

90. SOUTHPORT MARKET GATEWAY FEATURES (PUBLIC ART)

The Committee considered the report of the Leisure and Tourism Director that presented the stage 1 designs for the new Gateway Features to be placed at the corners of King Street/Eastbank Street and Market Street/Lord Street as part of the improvements to the public realm within the immediate vicinity of the Southport Market.

The report indicated that the vision for the Gateway Features was that they would highlight the presence of Southport Market; that they must provide an eye catching and relevant image associated with the area and be supported by the local community; and that ideally, they would be memorable and capable of further development for further use in other variations in other appropriate areas of the town centre.

The report also detailed the artist's brief; the appointment of the lead artist (Broadbent Studio); and images of the Gateway Features.

The report concluded that the Gateway Features should be completed by September 2011.

RESOLVED:

That this Area Committee cannot, in all conscience, support the spending in the current financial climate, of £112,000 of public money in the way suggested and the Cabinet be advised accordingly.

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