

Borough Council of  
**King's Lynn &  
West Norfolk**



# **CABINET**

## **Agenda**

**TUESDAY, 19 JUNE 2012  
at 5.30pm**

in the

**Committee Suite  
King's Court  
Chapel Street  
King's Lynn**



If you require parts of this document in another language, large print, audio, Braille or any alternative format please contact the Council Information Centre on 01553 616200 and we will do our best to help.

#### **LATVIAN**

Ja Jums nepieciešamas daļas no šī dokumenta citā valodā, lielā drukā, audio, Braila rakstā vai alternatīvā formātā, lūdzu, sazinieties ar Padomes informācijas centru (Council Information Centre) pa 01553 616200 un mēs centīsimies Jums palīdzēt.

#### **RUSSIAN**

Если вам нужны части этого документа на другом языке, крупным шрифтом, шрифтом Брайля, в аудио- или ином формате, обращайтесь в Информационный Центр Совета по тел.: 01553 616200, и мы постараемся вам помочь.

#### **LITHUANIAN**

Je pageidaujate tam tikros šio dokumento dalies kita kalba, dideliu šriftu, Brailio raštu, kitu formatu ar norite užsisakyti garso įrašą, susisiekite su Savivaldybės informacijos centru (Council Information Centre) telefonu 01553 616200 ir mes pasistengsime jums kiek įmanoma padėti.

#### **POLISH**

Jeśli pragną Państwo otrzymać fragmenty niniejszego dokumentu w innym języku, w dużym druku, w formie nagrania audio, alfabetem Braille'a lub w jakimkolwiek innym alternatywnym formacie, prosimy o kontakt z Centrum Informacji Rady pod numerem 01553 616200, zaś my zrobimy, co możemy, by Państwu pomóc.

#### **PORTUGUESE**

Se necessitar de partes deste documento em outro idioma, impressão grande, áudio, Braille ou qualquer outro formato alternativo, por favor contacte o Centro de Informações do Município pelo 01553 616200, e faremos o nosso melhor para ajudar.

Borough Council of  
**King's Lynn &  
West Norfolk**



King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 1EX  
Telephone: 01553 616200  
Fax: 01553 691663

**CABINET AGENDA**

**DATE: CABINET – TUESDAY, 19 JUNE 2012**

**VENUE: COMMITTEE SUITE, KING'S COURT, CHAPEL STREET, KING'S LYNN**

**TIME: 5.30 pm**

**1. MINUTES**

To approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 June 2012.

**2. APOLOGIES**

To receive apologies for absence.

**3. URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any business, which by reason of special circumstances, the Chairman proposes to accept, under Section 100(b)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

**4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Please indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one which is also prejudicial. A declaration of an interest should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote on the matter. If a prejudicial interest is declared, the member should withdraw from the room whilst the matter is discussed.

These declarations apply to all those members present, whether the member is part of the meeting, attending to speak as a local member on an item or simply observing the meeting from the public seating area.

5. **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

To receive any Chairman's correspondence.

6. **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

To note the names of any Councillors who wish to address the meeting under Standing Order 34.

7. **CALLED IN MATTERS**

To report on any Cabinet decisions called in.

8. **FORWARD DECISIONS LIST**

A copy of the Forward Decisions List is attached (Page 7 )

9. **MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET FROM OTHER COUNCIL BODIES**

To receive any comments and recommendations from other Council bodies some of which meet after the dispatch of this agenda. Copies of any comments made will be circulated as soon as they are available.

- Resources and Performance Panel - Audit Committee – 14 June 2012

10. **REPORTS**

1) **Norfolk County Council Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents – Representations to Pre Submission Documents (Page 9)**

The County Council has prepared two documents relating to the site specific choices for minerals and waste facilities sites across the county. These are at the final stage in the plan preparation process and it is recommended that representations are made to these. The intention is that our representations will be heard by an independent Inspector. The suggested representations cover subjects which include; the choices of minerals extraction sites; the use of safeguarding

areas; proposed uses on sites for waste treatment ; the way sites are distributed across the county; and where appropriate detailed individual points on sites.

## **2) Revenue Outturn 2011/2012 (Page 32)**

The report sets out in summary the revenue outturn of 2011/2012 for the General Fund (council tax accounts). The report shows details of the major differences between actual costs/income and the revised estimates for 2011/2012 reported in February monitoring.

The accounts show actual Borough spend of £18,303,305 which was £272,335 less than the Revised Estimate for 2011/2012 of £18,575,640. The working balance of the Council will stand at £3,549,738 on 31 March 2012.

## **3) Capital Programme and Resources 2011-2013 (Page 48)**

The report provides details of the outturn of the 2011/2012 capital programme and outlines amendments and rephasing to the spending on schemes, revising the programme for 2012/2013. The capital programme outturn for 2011/2012 totalled £5,542,502 against an approved budget of £6,211,930. It has been necessary to rephase a total of £852,990 of scheme costs to 2012/2013.

Capital receipts generated in the year totalled £692,288 of which £683,427 were useable.

## **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To consider passing the following resolution:

“That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item 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.”

## **4) Recycle Black Bin Waste – Progress Update (Page 69)**

On the 6th March 2012 Cabinet authorised Officers to commence contract negotiations with Duratrust, part of the Cardinal Mark group, for the recycling of ‘Black Bin Waste’. This report updates Members on the progress made to date and requests permission to progress the contract negotiations as laid out within this report in order to finalise contract terms for

the recycling of 'Black Bin Waste', with the 'Special Purpose Company' (SPC), set up by Duratrust for this purpose. It also requests permission to commence discussions with interested parties

To: Members of the Cabinet  
Councillors N J Daubney (Chairman), A Beales, Lord Howard,  
A Lawrence, B Long, Mrs E A Nockolds, D Pope and Mrs V Spikings.

Cabinet Scrutiny Committee

For further information, please contact:

Samantha Winter

Democratic Services Manager,

Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk

King's Court, Chapel Street,

King's Lynn PE30 1EX

Telephone: (01553) 616327 Email: [sam.winter@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:sam.winter@west-norfolk.gov.uk)

## FORWARD DECISIONS LIST

Officer Portfolio Responsible

### 3 July 2012

Lynnsport and COWA	Exec Dir Leisure and Public Space	Assets
Risk Based Verification Policy for Benefit claims	Deputy Chief Executive	Leader
Revised Procurement Strategy	Deputy Chief Executive	Leader
Annual Treasury Report 2011/12	Deputy Chief Executive	Leader
Hunstanton Land Disposal	Deputy Chief Executive	Regeneration
Request for Business Rate Relief	Deputy Chief Executive	Dep Leader

### 31 July 2012

Townscape Heritage Initiative	Exec Dir Regen and Planning	Regeneration / Development
Enterprise Centre	Exec Dir Regen and Planning	Regeneration
Bid to host CNC Building Control	Exec Dir Regen and Planning	Development

### 4 September 2012

#### 18 September 2012 (Accounts)

Annual Governance Statement	Exec Dir Central Services	Leader
Report of the Mart Task Group	Exec Dir Leisure and Public Space	Health and Wellbeing

### 2 October 2012

Local Authority Leisure Trust – Project Plan and Follow Up report	Chief Executive	Leader/ Assets
---	-----------------	----------------

### 30 October 2012

### 4 December 2012

#### Forthcoming Items, as yet unprogrammed

Local Council Tax Support Scheme	Deputy Chief Executive	Leader
Hunstanton – Proposed Land Disposal	Dep Chief Executive	Regeneration
Planning Fees	Exec Dir	Development

	Regeneration & Development	
Revised KLATS & KL Car Parking Strategy	Exec Dir Regeneration & Development	Regeneration / Health & Wellbeing
Community Cohesion Strategy	Chief Executive	Community
Town Centre Plan	Exec Dir Regeneration & Development	Regeneration
Care and Repair Framework Agreement	Exec Dir Environmental Health & Housing	Deputy Leader
Licensing of Caravan Sites	Exec Dir Environmental Health & Housing	Deputy Leader



## REPORT TO CABINET

<del>Open/Exempt</del>		Would any decisions proposed :		
<b>Any especially affected Wards ALL</b>	Mandatory/ <del>Discretionary/</del> <del>Operational</del>	(a) Within Cabinet's powers to decide <del>YES/NO</del> (b) Recommendations to Council <del>YES/NO</del>		
Lead Members: Cllr Brian Long E-mail: cllr.brian.long@west-norfolk.gov.uk Cllr Vivienne Spikings E-mail: cllr.vivienne.spikings@west-norfolk.gov.uk		Other Cabinet Members consulted: ALL		
		Other Members consulted: None		
Lead Officer: Alan Gomm E-mail: alan.gomm@west-norfolk.gov.uk Direct Dial: 01553 616237		Other Officers consulted: Chief Executive; Executive Director Planning and Regeneration.		
Financial Implications <del>YES/NO</del>	Policy Implications YES/ <del>NO</del>	Personnel Implications <del>YES/NO</del>	Equalities Impact Assessment Reqd No	Risk Management Implications <del>YES/NO</del>

Date of meeting: 19 June 2012

### 1 NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS – REPRESENTATIONS TO PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS

#### Summary

The County Council has prepared two documents relating to the site specific choices for minerals and waste facilities sites across the county. These are at the final stage in the plan preparation process and it is recommended that representations are made to these. The intention is that our representations will be heard by an independent Inspector. The suggested representations cover subjects which include; the choices of minerals extraction sites; the use of safeguarding areas; proposed uses on sites for waste treatment ; the way sites are distributed across the county; and where appropriate detailed individual points on sites.

#### Recommendation

That Cabinet agree:

1. That representations be made to the subjects indicated in the appendices to this report.
2. That Cabinet agrees to main elements of the representations suggested to be made as outlined in Appendices 1 and 2.
3. The final detail of the representations to be delegated to the Executive Director – Planning and Regeneration in conjunction with the Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Portfolio Holder for Development.

#### Reason for Decision

To enable the most efficient and effective form of the County Council mineral and waste site allocations document to be achieved reflecting the interests of West Norfolk.

## 1. Background

1.1 As part of its preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF), in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the County Council has produced two documents; a Waste and a Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). Its purpose is to set out specific, allocated sites where mineral extraction or waste facilities sites are considered acceptable in principal over the next 15 years.

1.2 The MWDF Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies DPD was adopted by the County Council on 26 September 2011. The period of the MWDF runs to the end of 2026.

1.3 The Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations DPDs are now at the Pre-Submission stage, and follow three public consultation stages in 2008, 2009 and 2011. These Pre-Submission versions of the DPDs have been prepared taking account of the previous consultation responses. They are published now in order for representations to be made as to its soundness and legal compliance, prior to submission to the Secretary of State, who will appoint an independent Inspector to undertake an examination. The closing date for representations to be made is 5pm on Friday 29 June.

1.4 The Borough Council has taken part in the previous stages and we are now at the critical stage of potentially making representations as to the soundness of the plans. References are made in the outline of representations to whether particular aspects of the plans considered are 'sound' etc. The Borough Council also made representations about the County Council's Core strategy for minerals and waste and took part in the Examination. That event dealt with more strategic issues and this current stage is choosing sites in the light of that strategic framework.

1.5 As there are two separate documents the report here is also structured in that way.

1.6 The County Council have provided a specific form for making representations about the documents. In the interests of brevity we have not reproduced a separate form for each of our suggested representations, but rather a table is given of the main elements and the grounds for making the representations. The recommendation is that the Executive Director – Planning and Regeneration is authorised to agree the final wording of the representations and any supporting documents as appropriate in consultation with two relevant Cabinet Portfolio Holders.

## 2. Minerals Site Specific Allocations document

2.1 The following sites are allocated for sand and gravel extraction

Parish	Site reference	Estimated resource (tonnes)
Pentney	MIN 19	700,000
Syderstone	MIN 45	3,600,000
Tottenhill	MIN 76	285,000
Watlington	MIN 75	335,000

The following sites are allocated for silica sand extraction (silica sand is only found in West Norfolk – hence a total figure is given):

Parish	Site reference	Estimated resource (tonnes)
Leziate	MIN 39	1,500,000

East Winch	MIN 40	3,000,000
Roydon, Castle Rising and Congham	MIN 41	1,900,000 (total resource 4,800,000 tonnes)
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6,400,000</b>

The following site is allocated for carstone extraction:

Parish	Site reference	Estimated resource (tonnes)
Middleton	MIN 06	1,416,000

2.2 A number of supporting documents have also been prepared and these consist of:

- Sustainability Appraisal Report and Appendices (x6)
- Statement of Consultation
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Evidence Base Update
- Flood Risk at Potential Minerals Sites – Sequential and Exception Tests
- Equality Impact Assessment

2.3 Overview of suggested representations

- There are concerns about the potential general ‘safeguarding areas’ for silica sand particularly, which underlie some of our housing growth areas. NCC has objected as part of our Site Allocations process. (We also considering this point as part of our own site allocations document but the publication of the minerals site choices provides an opportunity to raise it here also). We have checked the background information and context for the NCC policy for indicated safeguarding areas and actual extents of them. We do not consider that the logic of what NCC says it will do in the Core Strategy has necessarily been carried through into the sites document.
- We have also checked individual mineral site areas proposed to be allocated for the potential impacts on residents and other technical issues e.g. detailed issues arising from dust, noise etc. Representations have been suggested where it is considered inadequate protection is given by NCC.

2.4 Nine individual representations are suggested and these are outlined in Appendix 1. The Appendix provides a summary of the main elements of the representations, in some cases there will be additional supporting information to be submitted.

### 3. Waste Site Specific Allocations document

3.1 The following sites are allocated in West Norfolk for various types of waste related uses.

Parish	Site reference	Allocated for
King’s Lynn	WAS 05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ processing of recyclables,</li> <li>○ mixed waste processing,</li> <li>○ thermal treatment and</li> <li>○ other forms of residual waste treatment</li> </ul>

Middleton	WAS 25	○ inert landfill
Middleton	WAS 36	○ composting, ○ processing of recyclables (materials recovery facility), ○ inert waste recycling, and ○ waste transfer
Feltwell	WAS 37	○ composting
Middleton	WAS 40	○ inert landfill and ○ inert waste recycling
Docking	WAS 45	○ composting
King's Lynn	WAS 65	○ composting, ○ anaerobic digestion, ○ processing of recyclables, ○ mixed waste processing, ○ thermal treatment, and ○ other forms of residual waste treatment

### 3.2 Six supporting documents produced to accompany the plan itself:

- Sustainability Appraisal Report and Appendices (x6)
- Statement of Consultation
- Habitat Regulations Assessment
- Evidence Base Update
- Flood Risk at Potential Minerals Sites – Sequential and Exception Tests
- Equality Impact Assessment

### 3.3 Overview of suggested representations

- The Borough Council has made objections to the planning application for the incinerator at The Willows. Where appropriate these points have been carried forward in representations for site WAS 65 – The Willows.
- The flood risk assessment with the sequential / exception approach is questioned for sites WAS 05 and 65.
- Only three sites are put forward for uses including large scale 'thermal treatment' including the two at King's Lynn and one at Snetterton. Core Strategy policy CS16 states the need for major facilities to be near to Norwich, Great Yarmouth, Kings Lynn or Thetford (presumably to serve those areas efficiently) but there is no 'thermal treatment' facility planned in the eastern half of the county. Although other sites could carry out 'residual waste treatment'. There is an issue of consistency between proposed allocations and the intention of the Core Strategy.
- Individual waste site areas proposed to be allocated have been checked for the potential impacts on residents etc e.g. detailed issues arising from dust, noise etc. Representations are suggested if it is considered inadequate protection is being given by NCC.

3.4 A total of 18 individual representations are suggested and these are outlined in Appendix 2.

## 4 Proposed Outcomes

4.1 The Borough Council would expect that the representations as outlined in the Appendices will be considered carefully by the Examination Inspector and the suggested changes be made.

## **5 Financial Implications**

5.1 None directly arising from the content of the report. However it should be noted that the related issues of the incinerator and the current planning application and any action that may be taken in respect of that are not included here.

## **6 Risk Management Implications**

6.1 None directly arising from this report.

## **7 Policy Implications**

7.1 These documents relate to policy that the County Council are preparing. This Council is not responsible for minerals and waste policies as covered in these documents. However we are the waste collection authority and some of the sites / solutions proposed will impact on that role.

## **8 Equalities Impact Assessment**

8.1 The Pre-screening showed no need for a full assessment. No implications.

## **9 Any Other Implications**

9.1 None, other than those noted individually.

## **10 Alternative Options**

10.1 As part of the preparation of the County Council's documents alternative sites have been considered.

## **11 Access To Information**

11.1 Information used in the preparation of this report has come from publically available sources, including;

- The incinerator planning application 11/01064/CM.
- County Council supporting documents for the DPDs as listed.
- Background document containing detailed text for supporting the outline representations proposed in the report. (Available by e-mail from alan.gomm@west-norfolk.gov.uk)

**APPENDIX 1 – Recommendations for representations to be made in respect of Minerals related documents**

<b>Policy / Para</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Action required</b>	<b>Reason for requesting attendance at Examination</b>
<b>Minerals Pre – Submission DPD</b>			
<p><b>Safeguarding of mineral resources.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Text 2.10/p8.</b></li> <li>• <b>Map p9.</b></li> <li>• <b>Revised proposals map, p5 (definition of mineral safeguarding areas, evidence base).</b></li> <li>• <b>Inset map 2.</b></li> </ul>	<p>The “Safeguarded resource areas” should be refined as they cover a large expanse of land. The “Safeguarded silica sand resource” has been varied from the BGS <i>Norfolk Mineral Resources Map 2004 (as amended) prepared by the British Geological Survey</i> without credible evidence.</p> <p>The time line for introducing the Safeguarded resource areas” has been such in that the Borough Council has not until now had the opportunity to comment on the proposed areas.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lacks coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The safeguarded silica sand resource should be amended.</p>	<p>The issue of consistency with the Core Strategy is an important principle and needs to be adequately explored in a transparent manner.</p> <p>The introduction of safeguarded areas is and the amount of land contained within these areas is very important and needs to be considered in a transparent way.</p>
<p><b>MIN 6 - East Winch Road, Middleton (carstone)</b></p>	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate</li> </ul>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>

	wording to address adverse effects.		
<b>MIN 19 - Pentney Quarry, Pentney</b> (sand and gravel)	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	Policy wording should be amended	These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.
<b>MIN 39 - East Winch Road, Ashwicken</b> (silica sand)	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	Policy wording should be amended	These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.
<b>MIN 40 - Land East of Grand Court Farm, East Winch</b> (silica sand)	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	Policy wording should be amended	These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.
<b>MIN 41- Congham, Roydon and</b>	(This site was considered unsuitable for allocation in the May 2011 version of the 'Further Revised Issues and Options'. Therefore no representation was	Site should be deleted.	There is an important point about the sequence of choosing sites which have impacts on designated landscapes.

<p><b>Castle Rising</b> (silica sand)</p>	<p>made at that time). Notwithstanding the re-assessment made in the light of additional information by the County Council the Borough Council considers the revised site proposal to be unsuitable. The main reason is the impact on the landscape of the Gaywood Valley / Roydon Common (the later being an internationally designated site). Sites in such close proximity to designated sites should not be chosen in preference to other which would have less landscape impact even with proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The close proximity of residential properties leads to the conclusion that the site is not a suitable choice, particularly in air quality terms.</p> <p>As presented in the policy, and notwithstanding the above comments which request deletion of the site, appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so that they can be considered at the planning application stage and mitigation put in place.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area is lacking.</li> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities and organisations.</li> <li>○ It does not include appropriate wording</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
---	---	--	--



	to address adverse effects.		
<b>MIN 45 - Coxford Abbey Quarry, Syderstone</b> (sand and gravel)	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	Policy wording should be amended	These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.
<b>MIN 75 - Home Farm, Watlington</b> (sand and gravel)	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	Policy wording should be amended	These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.
<b>MIN 76 - West Field, Watlington</b> (sand and gravel)	<p>Appropriate amenity issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	Policy wording should be amended	These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.

**APPENDIX 2 - Recommendations for representations to be made in respect of Waste related documents**

<b><i>Policy / Para</i></b>	<b><i>Representation</i></b>	<b><i>Action required</i></b>	<b><i>Reason for requesting attendance at Examination</i></b>
-----------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

**Pre-Submission DPD**

<p><b>WAS 05 - Estuary Road King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>Para 6.5.4</b></p>	<p>It is stated that “the HRA concluded that, with appropriate mitigation and control measures, an outcome where no adverse effects on the integrity of the European or internationally designated sites would occur is achievable”. Given the applicant’s views set out in the Energy from Waste plant planning application which is 1.6 km further away from the SAC, and which is argued by the applicants to be only 0.03% from triggering a ‘likely significant effect’ it is hard to find how this comment can be justified. In fact it is more likely that a significant effect would occur on the nearby SAC. This must be corrected. Additional comments are made on the separate Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DELETE provision relating to ‘thermal treatment’ on this site.</p>	<p>The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>
<p><b>WAS 05 - Estuary Road King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>Para 6.5.5</b></p>	<p>This paragraph is misleading &amp; contradicts the conclusion in the supporting documentation that the site should be assessed against the Borough Council’s SFRA Climate Change maps. References to the other flood zones are therefore irrelevant in the context of this site.</p>	<p>DELETE proposed site</p>	<p>The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>

	<p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>WAS 05 - Estuary Road King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>Para 6.5.6</b></p>	<p>The text supporting the allocation of Site WAS 05 suggests that there are no other 'strategic' sites well related to King's Lynn. The description of site WAS 05 shows it to be capable of some 150 000t/pa for residual waste treatment. This is far in excess of that needed to serve the immediate West Norfolk area. Core Strategy policy CS 05 suggests that 'strategic' waste management facilities should be well related to the main towns in Norfolk. It goes on to state that 'There is a particular need for recovery (residual waste treatment) capacity to manage waste arising <b>from those settlements</b>'. This includes King's Lynn.</p> <p>It is the Borough Council's contention that the Site Allocations document is unsound as it does not adequately reflect the intentions of CS Policy CS05. By situating a facility which has more than local capacity it can be interpreted that the allocation is not consistent with the overall CS aspirations.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lacks coherence with the Minerals and Waste core strategy</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DELETE provision relating to 'thermal treatment' on this site.</p>	<p>The issue of consistency with the Core Strategy is an important point of principle and needs to be adequately explored in a transparent manner.</p>

<p><b>WAS 05 - Estuary Road King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>Para 6.5.6</b></p>	<p>There is a direct conflict between what the background topic document entitled 'Flood Risk at Potential Waste Sites: Sequential &amp; Exception Tests' says, and what is stated in this paragraph. The background paper rightly states that the Sequential Test must be carried out on a County-wide basis, for County-wide facilities. Para 6.5.6 however states that "<b>considering those strategic sites well-related to King's Lynn</b> (my emphasis), there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding which would be appropriate to allocate for development instead of site WAS05."</p> <p>This indicates that the County Council has carried out a search on a more local basis than the County-wide approach required. This would have to have the effect of rendering this particular policy unsound.</p> <p>It is also strongly disputed that the Sequential Test demonstrates that there are no reasonably available sites in and across the County at a lower risk of flooding, and supporting evidence is provided to support this assertion.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DELETE proposed site</p>	<p>The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>
<p><b>WAS 05 - Estuary Road King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>Para 6.5.7</b></p>	<p>Notwithstanding the principal objections appropriate responses to amenity and air quality issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application stage and mitigation put in place.</p>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>

	<p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>WAS 05 – Estuary Road King’s Lynn (Policy page 58)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It should be noted that planning permission exists on this site for a solar array at present.</li> <li>○ In addition the site falls within flood zone 3a using the correct flood risk maps (the Council’s SFRA with Climate Change maps), and is a site with a high risk of flooding. Development should be directed to sites with a lower risk of flooding, certainly for sites with a County wide waste function.</li> <li>○ There is also concern here that the same constraints that exist at WAS65, and have become evident through the planning application at that site for an Energy from Waste plant, are evident here i.e. even closer proximity to sensitive sites such as the Wash and Roydon Common etc. This would also weigh against this site for thermal treatment and it should not be allocated for this use.</li> <li>○ Therefore should WAS 5 still be allocated for other forms of local level waste treatment facilities, they must not have the potential to impact on sensitive areas, and thermal treatment must be excluded for the reasons set out above.</li> </ul> <p>There are also concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Air quality/ amenity of local residents and potential impact on local air quality.</li> <li>○ Visual intrusion.</li> </ul>	<p>DELETE proposed site</p>	<p>The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Thermal treatment does not support waste hierarchy.</li><li>○</li></ul> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Justified<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li></ul></li><li>○ Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

<p><b>WAS 25 – East Winch Road/ Mill Drove Middleton</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate amenity and air quality issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application and mitigation put in place.</li> <li>• Concern over access issues.</li> </ul> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>
<p><b>WAS 36 - East Winch Road/ Mill Drove Middleton</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate amenity and air quality issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application and mitigation put in place</li> <li>• Concern over access issues</li> </ul> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>
<p><b>WAS 37 - Lodge Road, Feltwell</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate amenity and air quality issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application and mitigation put in place.</li> <li>• Proximity principle issues</li> <li>• Concern over access issues.</li> </ul> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>

<p><b>WAS 40 - Mill Drove, Middleton</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over air quality/ amenity of local residents and potential impact on local air quality</li> <li>Concern over access issues</li> <li>Proximity principle issues</li> </ul> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>
<p><b>WAS 45 - Docking Common, Docking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate amenity and air quality issues need to be explicitly written into the policy so they can be considered at planning application and mitigation put in place.</li> <li>Concern over access issues</li> </ul> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective as it does not include appropriate wording to address adverse effects.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy wording should be amended</p>	<p>These are site specific issues affecting the appropriateness of the proposed allocation.</p>
<p><b>WAS 65- The Willows King's Lynn Para 6.65.4</b></p>	<p>This seems to be pre-empting issues that have yet to be properly considered through the determination of the incinerator planning application. There are concerns with a conclusion at this stage that there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of the European designated sites.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DELETE provision relating to 'thermal treatment' on this site.</p>	<p>The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>



	facts.		
<b>WAS 65- The Willows King's Lynn Para 6.65.5</b>	<p>This paragraph is misleading &amp; contradicts the conclusion in the supporting documentation that the site should be assessed against the Borough Council's SFRA Climate Change maps. References to the other flood zones are therefore irrelevant in the context of this site.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	DELETE proposed site	The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.
<b>WAS 65- The Willows King's Lynn Para 6.65.6</b>	<p>There is a direct conflict between what the background topic document entitled 'Flood Risk at Potential Waste Sites: Sequential &amp; Exception Tests' says, and what is stated in this paragraph. The background paper rightly states that the Sequential Test must be carried out on a County-wide basis, for County-wide facilities. Para 6.65.6 however states that "<b>considering those strategic sites well-related to King's Lynn</b> (my emphasis), there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding which would be appropriate to allocate for development instead of site WAS65."</p> <p>This indicates that the County Council has carried out a search on a more local basis than the County-</p>	DELETE proposed site	The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.

	<p>wide approach required. This would have to have the effect of rendering this particular policy unsound.</p> <p>It is also strongly disputed that the Sequential Test demonstrates that there are no reasonably available sites in the County, &amp; supporting evidence is provided to support this assertion.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>WAS 65- The Willows King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>Para 6.65.6</b></p>	<p>The text supporting the allocation of Site WAS 65 suggests that there are no other 'strategic' sites well related to King's Lynn. The description of site WAS 65 shows it to be capable of some 250 000t/pa for residual waste treatment. This is far in excess of that needed to serve the immediate West Norfolk area. Core Strategy policy CS 65 suggests that 'strategic' waste management facilities should be well related to the main towns in Norfolk. It goes on to state that 'There is a particular need for recovery (residual waste treatment) capacity to manage waste arising <b>from those settlements</b>'. This includes King's Lynn.</p> <p>It is the Borough Council's contention that the Site Allocations document is unsound as it does not adequately reflect the intentions of CS Policy CS05. By situating a facility which has more than local</p>	<p>DELETE provision relating to 'thermal treatment' on this site.</p>	<p>The issue of consistency with the Core Strategy is an important point of principle and needs to be adequately explored in a transparent manner.</p>

	<p>capacity it can be interpreted that the allocation is not consistent with the overall CS aspirations.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lacks coherence with the Minerals and Waste core strategy</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>WAS 65- The Willows King's Lynn</b> <b>(Policy page 72)</b></p>	<p>The site falls within flood zone 3a, as set out within the Borough Council's SFRA. There are also considered to be reasonably available alternative sites within the County to take strategic scale waste treatment facilities. This site is therefore considered to fail the Sequential Test, and its allocation would be contrary to the NPPF &amp; its technical guidance, and to the Minerals &amp; Waste Core Strategy policy DM4. This evidence has already been submitted to the County Council as part of a detailed planning application but will be sent in along with this representation.</p> <p>This site is the subject of a planning application for an 'Energy from Waste' plant. Given the strong objections that have been raised to this proposal during detailed consideration of the planning application, at the very least thermal treatment should be removed from the allocation, and the site described as being unsuitable for this use. Detailed objections to an allocation for thermal treatment on this site are made on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) Failure to comply with the Sequential test</p>	<p>DELETE proposed site</p>	<p>The allocation of this site for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>

	<p>(see above) and consequently contrary to PPS10, the NPPF and it's technical guidance, and policy DM4 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Potential significant impact on an SSSI and a SAC contrary to the NPPF.</li> <li>3) Potential unsustainable form of waste management through the need to transport large quantities of waste generated elsewhere in the County to its western most extremity, contrary to the need for a sustainable waste management regime as set out in PPS10.</li> </ol> <p>Large scale thermal treatment on this site as a way of dealing with the County's residual municipal waste will act as a disincentive to continue to increase recycling rates, contrary to the principles of a sustainable waste management regime.</p> <p>There are also concerns over air quality/ amenity of local residents and potential impact on local air quality.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li> <li>○ Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area does not support the proposal.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>WAS 65- The</b>	As referred to at length above a planning application	DELETE provision	The allocation of this site for the

<p><b>Willows King's Lynn</b></p> <p><b>(Policy page 72)</b></p>	<p>is before the County Council for consideration. There is every likelihood that it will be determined before the Waste Site Specific Allocations DPD comes before an Examination and the merits of individual cases have been debated, and any allocations made in the light of that debate. The principle of a site being suitable for a use must be agreed through the DPD process.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area will not have been considered if the planning application is determined in a pre-emptive way.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>relating to 'thermal treatment' on this site.</p>	<p>proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>
--	--	--	--

**'Flood Risk at Potential Waste Sites: Sequential & Exception Tests' document**

	<p>PPS25 has been replaced by the NPPF, and the supporting Technical Guidance to the NPPF. The Sequential &amp; Exception tests will need to be updated to refer to this guidance.</p> <p>As stated the correct approach is to look at the whole of Norfolk when carrying out a Sequential test.</p> <p>The application of the Sequential test is deeply flawed within the supporting document. Paragraph 101 of the NPPF states:  "The aim of the Sequential test is to steer development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. <b>Development should not be allocated</b> (my emphasis) or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of</p>	<p>DELETE proposed sites WAS 05 and WAS 65.</p>	<p>The allocation of these sites for the proposed uses raises serious issues locally and in respect of the overall Core Strategy policies. These issues need to be debated in a transparent way.</p>
--	--	---	--

flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. A sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding.”

The County Council’s supporting document should therefore identify all the potential waste sites in the County in Flood Zone 1 as preferential sites in the first stage in screening the allocation of County-wide facilities. It should then move to flood zones 2 and then 3, as lower preferences. There may be legitimate reasons for allocating sites outside flood zone 1 but these need to be properly investigated and set out. There is little proper justification for the proposed allocation of the 6 sites in higher risk flood zones, and no assessment of reasonable alternatives.

NCC’s supporting document on flood risk is therefore too brief and lacks substance. It is stated that “The County Council has concluded that the site selection process satisfies the Sequential Test, and that no site has been identified for allocation where there would be a suitable alternative in an area in a lower category of risk of flooding”. There is minimal context to this sweeping statement.

Six sites outside of flood zone 1 are put forward for allocation. These are then discussed individually as to why they have been allocated. With regards to the King’s Lynn sites, both are 100% within Flood Zone 3a. The explanation as to why these sites, and the other 4 in high flood risk areas within the County are proposed for allocation, particularly in the context of strategic scale sites is because the uses are “Less Vulnerable”. This is a flawed interpretation of how the Sequential Test works. The test should be

	<p>whether other sites are 'reasonably available' at lower risk of flooding. Only when you have carried out this assessment of reasonably alternative sites do you take the next step in looking whether there is a need to apply the exception test based on the vulnerability classifications. There is no mention of this approach in the document.</p> <p>DPD is UNSOUND in respect of this issue. It is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Justified<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are not backed up by facts.</li></ul></li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

## REPORT TO CABINET

<b>Open</b>		Would any decisions proposed :		
<b>Any especially affected Wards</b>	Mandatory/ Operational	(a) Be entirely within Cabinet's powers to decide	YES	
		(b) Need to be recommendations to Council	NO	
		(c) Be partly for recommendations to Council and partly within Cabinet's powers –	NO	
Lead Member: Cllr N Daubney E-mail:		Other Cabinet Members consulted:		
		Other Members consulted:		
Lead Officer: Toby Cowper E-mail: <a href="mailto:toby.cowper@west-norfolk.gov.uk">toby.cowper@west-norfolk.gov.uk</a> Direct Dial: 01553 616523		Other Officers consulted: Management Team. Service Managers.		
Financial Implications YES	Policy/Personnel Implications NO	Statutory Implications (incl S.17) YES	Equal Opportunities Implications NO	Risk Management Implications NO

**Cabinet Date: 19 June 2012**

### **2 REVENUE OUTTURN 2011/2012**

#### **Summary**

The report sets out in summary the revenue outturn of 2011/2012 for the General Fund (council tax accounts). The report shows details of the major differences between actual costs/income and the revised estimates for 2011/2012 reported in February monitoring.

The accounts show actual Borough spend of £18,303,305 which was £272,335 less than the Revised Estimate for 2011/2012 of £18,575,640. The working balance of the Council will stand at £3,549,738 on 31 March 2012.

#### **Recommendation**

**It is recommended that Cabinet approves the revenue outturn and proposed transfers to reserves for 2011/2012.**

#### **Reason for Decision**

The revenue outturn for 2011/2012 of the Council must be approved by Cabinet prior to the external audit of accounts which commences in July 2012.



## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the revenue outturn of the Council's budget for 2011/2012, the details of which will be used to form the Statement of Accounts later in the year.
- 1.2 The Statement of Accounts for 2011/2012 will be taken to Cabinet on the 18<sup>th</sup> September, for approval by Council on the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2012. (By law, the approval and publishing of the Statement of Accounts has to be completed by the 30th September 2012).

## 2 Final Outturn 2011/2012

- 2.1 The table below shows a revised budget for 2011/2012 as noted in the February 2012 Monitoring Report. This differs from that included in the Financial Plan 2011/2015 as reported to Cabinet in February 2012 where figures were based on information as at December 2011.
- 2.2 The summary shows an underspend of £272,335 which offsets the necessity to draw from balances as planned. The actual reduction in balances is £8,625.

	<b>Revised Estimate 2011/12 £</b>	<b>Actual 2011/12 £</b>	<b>Difference Revised to Actual £</b>
Community and Democracy	3,945,570	3,907,866	(37,704)
Environmental Improvements and Protection	5,505,810	5,382,295	(123,515)
Housing	1,652,900	1,138,098	(514,802)
Performance and Resources	8,118,060	8,097,077	(20,983)
Regeneration	558,250	662,453	104,203
Safer and Healthy Communities	309,380	267,323	(42,057)
<b>Portfolio Totals</b>	<b>20,089,970</b>	<b>19,455,112</b>	<b>(634,858)</b>
Financing Adjustment	(3,026,080)	(2,663,557)	362,523
Special Expenses	(554,880)	(554,880)	-
Internal Drainage Boards	2,579,230	2,579,230	-
Contribution (from) Restructuring Reserve	96,440	96,440	-
Government Grant Council			
Tax Freeze	(157,440)	(157,440)	-
New Homes Bonus	(451,600)	(451,600)	-
Contribution (from)/to Balances	(280,960)	(8,625)	272,335
	<b>18,294,680</b>	<b>18,294,680</b>	<b>-</b>

- 2.3 The operations of the Council over the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012 have continued to look for opportunities to produce budget savings that support the Council's drive for reduction in costs. During 2011/2012 service managers have been successful in holding posts vacant for periods of time to produce savings on salary budgets of £320,000. It is not a position that can be guaranteed to continue but every opportunity to produce such savings will be examined in the current year.
- 2.4 The Council's drive for efficiency in terms of reducing CO2 and associated utility /fuel bills is also having an effect and in 2011/2012 savings of £51,000 were made against set budgets.
- 2.5 Income received over the past year has also exceeded expectations. At the time of setting the budget, service managers were very cautious of the economic climate and estimates in terms of income reflected those views. Across most of the service areas income has actually held previous levels and in certain services exceeded expectation. Overall, income is some £300,000 plus above estimates in 2011/2012.
- 2.6 The 2011/2012 outturn is within budget and allows the Council to set aside funds for a variety of future demands in addition to carrying forward a general fund balance that is higher than originally estimated. A number of the budget savings were 'one-offs' and will not necessarily be repeated in future years. Others were 'early wins' on cost reduction initiatives where savings have already been incorporated in the 2012/2013 budget but not accounted for in 2011/2012. There are, however, some savings in the year that will carry forward and will reduce budgets set out in the Financial Plan for 2012/2015. The results of the outturn will be examined to look at the potential impact on the current year and future year's budgets, and any ongoing reductions will be included as part of the monthly monitoring reports.

**3. The major differences in the revised estimates and the actual costs are as follows:**

**3.1 Community and Democracy – Surplus (£37,704)**

	£
Unsupported Borrowing	(37,129)
Movements to be explained	(447,755)
Additional transfers to reserves	361,490
REFCUS	<u>85,690</u>
<b>Surplus</b>	<b><u>(37,704)</u></b>

In the case of the savings on unsupported borrowing this has occurred where the anticipated replacement of equipment has not been made. Service managers have in effect delayed the renewals for a year thereby gaining a one off saving in 2011/2012. It is intended to use the on-going budget in 2012/2013 to make the renewals where necessary. The additional charge to service for Reserve Expenditure Funded from Capital Under Statute (REFCUS) represents capital spending on grants that were above the budget originally included in the estimates

for the year. The charge for capital is reversed out in the accounts as part of the Financing Adjustment.

The major variances are as follows:

- **Financial Assistance**  
Underspend on grants of £28,556 of which £11,190 was transferred to reserves to fund additional spending on Capital grants.
- **CCTV**  
An overall surplus of £13,824 of which, £10,872 is due to additional and one off external income.
- **Councillors Allowances and Expenses**  
The budget for allowances was underspent by £30,034 spending on travel was £7,000 less than estimated, special responsibilities were under budget by £10,000, training by £4,000, National Insurance £3,500 and insurance £4,000.
- **Register of Electors**  
An overall saving of £15,036 which was due to staff savings of £25,000 which was offset by additional supplies and services of £9,000
- **Parks, Open Spaces and Sports Grounds**  
  
A saving of £29,575 which is the result of underspends of £7,000 on Greyfrairs Tower, £10,000 saving on MUGA, £12,500 on the Walks staffing and utilities and £9,000 saving on play areas electricity. These were offset by overspends of £5,000 on the upgrade of the skatepark at Hunstanton Recreation Ground and £9,000 on the refurbishment of the Downham Market Federation squash courts.
- **Allotments**  
A saving of £11,273 has been achieved due to additional rental income of £4,000 and an underspend on fly tipping and repairs of £7,000.
- **Swimming Pools**  
A saving of £75,601 has been made due to £22,000 overachievement of income and savings on staffing of £8,000, utilities £34,000, telephones £5,000 and advertising of £10,000.
- **Lynnsport Leisure Park**  
A saving of £35,948 has been made due to £6,000 overachievement of income and savings on utilities £8,000, and repairs and maintenance of £24,000.

- **King's Lynn Town Hall / Gaol House**  
Savings of £26,864 were made due to savings on staff costs of £29,000 as a result of services reviews, overspend of £7,000 on repairs and underspend of £8,000 on health and safety expenditure which has been delayed until 2012/2013.
- **Resort Services & King's Lynn Car Parks**  
Savings of £151,214 which were mainly attributable to additional income of £54,000, staff savings of £16,000 and net surplus of £72,790 on the car park operations.
- **Grants and Subscriptions**  
Savings of £21,332 mainly due to underspend on leisure subscription fees.

#### Summary of Budget Movements

	£
Financial Assistance	(28,556)
CCTV	(13,824)
Councillors Allowances and Expenses	(30,034)
Register of Electors	(15,036)
Parks, Open Spaces and Sports Grounds	(29,575)
Allotments	(11,273)
Swimming Pools	(75,601)
Lynnsport Leisure Park	(35,948)
King's Lynn Town Hall / Gaol House	(26,864)
Resort Services and King's Lynn Car Parks	(151,214)
Grants and Subscriptions	(21,332)
Other	(8,498)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u><u>(447,755)</u></u>

As part of the closing of accounts, the opportunity has been taken to set up transfers to reserves as follows:

- **Financial Assistance - £11,190**  
£11,190 transferred from the underspend on revenue grants to meet the additional spend on Capital Grants.
- **St James Swimming and Leisure - £43,200**  
£10,000 transfer to meet the cost of floor repairs and replacement lighting.  
£33,200 transfer to contribute towards the replacement air handling unit.
- **Lynnsport - £38,500**  
£35,000 transfer to capital mostly for the replacement of the 3G sports pitch.  
£3,500 transfer to the repair reserve to fund electrical testing delayed in 2011/2012.

- **King's Lynn Town Hall - £8,000**  
£8,000 transfer to the repair reserve to fund health and safety works and electrical testing delayed in 2011/2012.
- **Custom House TIC - £4,000**  
£4,000 transfer to the repair reserve to fund delayed repair works.
- **Resort – £196,600**  
£12,000 transfer will help meet the cost of barriers for crowd control at events.  
£175,000 transfer towards replacement pay and display machines.  
£8,500 transfer for cash handling office upgrade.  
£1,100 transfer to capital towards the cost of lighting at Hunstanton.
- **Oasis - £15,000**  
£15,000 transfer to the repair reserve to fund café equipment and health and safety requirements.
- **Corn Exchange - £30,000**  
£30,000 transfer to fund replacement follow spot lights and seating repairs.
- **Princess Theatre - £15,000**  
£15,000 transfer to cover external repairs and maintenance.

Transfers to Reserves:

	£
Financial Assistance	11,190
St James Swimming and Leisure	43,200
Lynnsport	38,500
King's Lynn Town Hall	8,000
Custom House TIC	4,000
Resort	196,600
Oasis	15,000
Corn Exchange	30,000
Princess Theatre	15,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>361,490</u>

### 3.2 Environmental Improvement and Protection – Surplus (£123,515)

	£
Movement to explain	(247,165)
Additional transfer to reserves	123,650
<b>Surplus</b>	<u>(123,515)</u>

The major variances are as follows:

- Refuse and Recycling**  
 The account shows an overall surplus of £151,128. This is mainly attributable to increased tonnage of recyclables. This has resulted in increased profit share from the Income Share Agreement with NEWS of £219,000 and direct net income of £25,000. There were savings of £62,000 due to timing differences with the purchase of software in 2010/2011 and maintenance savings of £5,000. Additional costs were incurred for fencing and bins of £15,000 towards Capital. Finally there was a loss on commercial income of £40,000 and trade refuse fees of £100,000 due to falling volumes as a result of direct competition from the private sector.
- Footway Lighting**  
 A saving of £7,400 has been made on general repairs and £9,100 on electricity, as there are now fewer lamp columns and the increase in the contract price was less than estimated for.
- Public Cleansing**  
 A saving of £24,000 has been achieved on vehicles, mainly due to savings on repairs and diesel costs. There is a saving of £21,000 across various supplies and services, as well as additional income of £3,700 and £9,500 from dog bin emptying.
- Land Drainage**  
 There is an underspend of £11,400 against the land drainage budget.

Summary of Budget Movements

	£
Refuse and Recycling	(151,128)
Footway Lighting	(16,500)
Public Cleansing	(58,200)
Land Drainage	(11,400)
Other	(9,937)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u><u>(247,165)</u></u>

As part of the closing of accounts the opportunity has been taken to set up transfers to reserve as follows:

- Refuse and Recycling - £93,650**  
 £93,650 transfer to be made towards the costs of waste management software of £48,650; new bins £25,000; Improved food waste containers for flats £10,000 and finally a PR/Communications Fund of £10,000. All of these are one-off costs that will be incurred in 2012/2013.
- Public Cleansing - £30,000**  
 £10,000 transfer to be made for Street Naming signage and a transfer of £20,000 has been made for an automatic watering system for The Walks that is sourced from a borehole.

Transfer to Reserves:

	£
Refuse and Recycling	93,650
Public Cleansing	30,000
TOTAL	<u>123,650</u>

### 3.3 Housing - Surplus (£514,802)

	£
Movements to be explained	(377,952)
Additional transfers to reserves	339,475
REFCUS	<u>(476,325)</u>
<b>Surplus</b>	<u>(514,802)</u>

The additional charge to service for Reserve Expenditure Funded from Capital Under Statute (REFCUS) represents capital spending on housing grants that were under the budget originally included in the estimates for the year. The credit for capital is reversed out in the accounts as part of the Financing Adjustment.

The major variances are as follows:

- **Community Centres**  
An additional cost of £20,305 has been incurred primarily due to the acquisition of two community centres during the year, at South Lynn and Fairstead, and uncertainty about the start-up costs.
- **Home Energy Conservation Act**  
A saving in consultancy, promotion and advertising costs has resulted in a surplus of £8,330.
- **Home Improvement Agency**  
An overall reduction in income of £6,000 has been offset by an underspend of £17,000 on small projects for the LIST project, together with £43,000 underspend on maintenance, plant and equipment for Careline due to repairs and maintenance being undertaken by employees and not the external contractor giving a surplus of £53,773 within Care and Repair.
- **Homechoice**  
There have been savings of £18,565 due to changes made in printing and advertising. This has been achieved by changing printing from colour to black and white and reducing the size of Homechoice publications.
- **Housing Options**  
There have been savings of £43,916, mostly due to an underspend of £43,585 on projects supported by the external grant through the

Homelessness Prevention Fund. This has been transferred to reserves to support the homelessness strategy.

- **Housing and Council Tax Benefit**

A surplus of £239,945 has been achieved on this budget. This is due to additional income recovered for overpayments of £48,440 and a small variance on the Subsidy return of £47,600. There were also vacant posts within Benefits resulting in further savings of £136,000. Savings were achieved on software maintenance of £16,275.

- **Housing Grants**

A saving of £39,875 resulting from salary savings.

Summary of Budget Movements

	£
Community Centres	20,305
Home Energy Conservation Act	(8,330)
Home Improvement Agency	(53,773)
Homechoice	(18,565)
Housing Options	(43,916)
Housing and Council Tax Benefit	(239,945)
Housing Grants	(39,875)
Other Housing	6,147
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u><u>(377,952)</u></u>

As part of the closing of accounts the opportunity has been taken to set up transfers to reserve as follows:

- **Housing Options - £43,585**

£43,585 transfer to be made to the homelessness strategy reserve. This fund is required to extend capacity in the private rented sector for homeless families and to fund a service level agreement with the Citizens Advice Bureau to provide housing advice.

- **Housing Grants - £40,000**

£40,000 transfer to be made for a fixed term Housing Standards Post to meet demand for Care and Repair backlog and to develop the service.

- **W N Fuel Poverty Forum - £5,890**

£5,890 to be transferred to reserves to meet the anticipated costs for Housing Market Research.

- **Benefit Administration - £250,00**

£250,000 transfer to be made as a contingency fund required to mitigate the risk of breaching the Local Authority Threshold Error during the period 2012/2013, when the new Revenues and Benefit Partnership computer system is being installed.



Transfer to Reserves:

	£
Housing Options	43,585
Housing Grants	40,000
W N Fuel Poverty Forum	5,890
Benefit Administration	250,000
TOTAL	<u>339,475</u>

### 3.4 Performance and Resources – Surplus (£20,983)

	£
Movements to explain	(423,388)
Additional transfers to reserves	402,405
<b>Surplus</b>	<u>(20,983)</u>

The major variances are as follows:

- **Cost of Collection**  
A saving of £92,327 of which the main items are a surplus of £166,832 due to additional cost recovered on Council Tax offset by an increase in the Council Tax bad debt provision of £63,184.
- **Corporate Communications**  
A underspend of £11,682 of which £9,159 was from staffing savings.
- **Corporate Costs and Provisions**  
There was a net savings of £40,436 which is predominantly a combination of factors: £12,016 against salaries; £21,355 against Audit Fee; £10,201 Best Value surveys.
- **Bad Debt Provision**  
An increase in the General Fund Bad Debt provision of £29,899.
- **Corporate Management Team**  
A underspend of £19,610 due mainly from to a saving against salaries of £18,722.
- **Corporate Initiatives**  
A saving of £10,832 primarily due to a reduction in the computer software charge.
- **Equal Opportunities**  
A saving of £9,916 primarily due to a reduction in demand for small projects.
- **Flood Prevention**  
£21,250 saving due to the Hunstanton promenade condition survey not happening until 2012/2013

- **Financial Support**  
£6,050 NNDR discretionary Rate Relief overspend.
- **Performance**  
There is a net savings of £253,284 which is predominantly a combination of factors against the central support services budgets and corporate budgets. These include: savings against the new arrangements for Legal Commissioning of £48,564; savings against printing budgets of £44,660 and savings against training and relocation budgets of £58,569.

#### Summary of Budget Movements

	£
Cost of Collection	(92,327)
Corporate Communications	(11,682)
Corporate Costs and Provisions	(40,436)
Bad Debt provision	29,899
Corporate Management Team	(19,610)
Corporate Initiatives	(10,832)
Equal Opportunities	(9,916)
Flood Prevention	(21,250)
Financial Support	6,050
Performance	<u>(253,284)</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>(423,388)</u></b>

As part of closing the accounts the opportunity has been taken to set up additional transfers to reserves:

#### **Corporate Costs and Provisions - £168,000**

- £143,000 transfer to capital reserve to fund the installation of Solar Panels at King's Court and Lynn Sport.
- £25,000 transfer to capital reserve to fund the cost of new brown and white road signs for the A47

#### **Performance - £234,405**

- £141,570 to bring the Incinerator campaign fund up to £250,000
- £25,000 transfer to repair reserve to fund office moves within King's Court
- £25,000 transfer to reserve to develop the Council financial system (QSP) for use with multiple companies.
- £20,000 transfer to reserve to meet the cost of the Hunstanton promenade condition survey
- £22,835 transfer from the Insurance Holding account to maintain Insurance reserves.

Transfers to Reserves:

	£
Corporate Costs and Provisions	168,000
Performance	234,405
TOTAL	<u>402,405</u>

### 3.5 Regeneration - Deficit £104,203

	£
Movements to explain	(53,263)
Additional Transfers to Reserves	52,916
REFCUS	104,550
<b>Deficit</b>	<u>104,203</u>

The additional charge to service for Reserve Expenditure Funded from Capital Under Statute (REFCUS) represents capital spending on the COWA grant that was above the budget originally included in the estimates for the year. The charge for capital is reversed out in the accounts as part of the Financing Adjustment.

The major variances are as follows:

- **Economic Development**  
In the February Monitoring Report a saving was reported in respect of certain schemes slipped into 2012/2013. However, these schemes were completed sooner than anticipated and the payments made in 2011/2012. This has resulted in an overspend of £17,500.
- **Estates**  
The rental income from industrial units is higher than expected which has resulted in a saving of £27,400.
- **General Markets**  
An initial shortfall of £10,300 due to a reduction in market rents has been offset by a saving in market clearance costs of £6,000. This has resulted in a net shortfall of £4,300.
- **General Properties**  
A surplus of £14,750 due to a saving in general repairs.
- **Regeneration Projects**  
Income received for room hire at the South Lynn Community Centre has resulted in a saving of £6,600.
- **Rural Transport Development**  
A saving of £9,200 has been achieved due to an underspend in transport subsidies costs.

- **Publicity and Tourism**

A saving in Special Promotions has resulted in a saving of £21,000.

Summary of Budget Movements

	£
Economic Development	17,500
Industrial Estates	(27,400)
General Markets	4,300
General Properties	(14,750)
Regeneration Projects	(6,600)
Rural Transport Development	(9,200)
Publicity and Tourism	(21,000)
Other	3,887
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u><u>(53,263)</u></u>

As part of closing the accounts, additional transfers to reserves have been made;

- **General Properties - £10,600**

£10,600 transfer to be made in 2011/2012 to support the costs of ongoing bridge maintenance work.

- **Regeneration Projects - £23,370**

£23,370 transfer to be made in 2011/2012. Additional rental income and remaining grant income totalling £10,870 has been transferred to be used on projects in future years. A contribution of £12,500 has been transferred to assist in the funding of the Pontoon.

- **Publicity and Tourism - £16,000**

£16,000 transfer to be made in 2011/2012 to support the costs of the forthcoming signage work of £15,000. A further £1,000 has been transferred to meet the costs for the Hanse project.

- **Industrial Estates/Vancouver Centre - £2,946**

The administration fee for service statements of £2,946 has been moved to Reserve to help fund future costs.

Transfers to Reserves:

	£
General Properties	10,600
Regeneration Projects	23,370
Publicity and Tourism	16,000
Industrial Estates/Vancouver Centre	2,946
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u><u>52,916</u></u>

### 3.6 Safer and Healthy Communities – Surplus (£42,057)

	£
Movements to be explained	(67,767)
Additional transfer to reserves	25,710
<b>Surplus</b>	<u>(42,057)</u>

The significant items for the variance are:

- **Food Hygiene**  
There has been an underspend of £14,700 on this budget as the costs to transport samples to the laboratory for testing have been waved for the present as they have changed location. Income from export licence fees £3,300 higher than estimated due to the higher number of applications.
- **Dog Warden**  
A saving of £4,500 has been achieved from underspends on the purchase of bins and vets fees.
- **Licences**  
There is a surplus of £10,000 due to higher than estimated income from Entertainment Licences, and a £3,000 under spend on contractor fees.
- **Crematorium**  
Although an expected shortfall in income was reported in February monitoring, the actual income received was higher than anticipated resulting in surplus of £22,000. There has also been a surplus on the memorial sales of £5,000, Utility savings of £3,000 and overtime savings of £1,800 as there have been fewer late and weekend services.
- **Open Cemeteries**  
A shortfall of £16,700 in income due to reduced numbers of burials, this has been offset by a savings of £9,000 on grave digging charges and £4,000 on repairs.
- **Health Promotions**  
A general saving of £4,990 has been achieved.

Movements to be explained

	£
Food Hygiene	(18,000)
Dog Warden	(4,500)
Licencing	(13,000)
Crematorium	(31,700)
Open Cemeteries	3,700
Health Promotions	(4,990)
Other savings	723
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>(67,767)</u>

As part of closing the accounts, additional transfers to reserves have been made;

- **Crematorium - £20,000**  
£20,000 transfer to reserves to be made to cover the current urgent works being carried out on cremator 3, along with the extra mandatory testing required afterwards.
- **Cemeteries - £5,170**  
£5,170 transfer to repair reserve to be made to fund the cost of memorial safety training and equipment so that testing can be carried out internally in future.

Transfers to Reserves:

	£
Crematorium	20,000
Cemeteries	5,170
TOTAL	<u>25,170</u>

### 3.7 Financing Adjustment – (£362,737)

The major element of the deficit can be explained as follows

	£
Net savings in external interest	(70,219)
REFCUS - Revenue expenditure funded from capital under statute	(286,085)
An increase in minimum revenue provision compared to estimate	(6,433)
TOTAL	<u>(362,737)</u>

At the time of writing this report variances from budget for depreciation had not been applied to the General Fund. These variances for depreciation will not have a bottom line impact on the outturn.

### 4.0 General Fund Working Balance

The underspend on the budget for 2011/2012 results in an small decrease to the General Fund working balance of £8,625 which provides for a revised balance of the General Fund as at 31 March 2012 of £3,549,738.

### 5.0 Financial Implications

The accounts show that the general fund balance is £3,549,738 this is higher than the level anticipated in the Financial Plan – 2011/2015,

adjusted by February monitoring, and it will be used over a period of years to help maintain council tax levels.

**6.0 Policy Implications**

None

**7.0 Statutory Considerations**

The revenue outturn for 2011/2012 must be approved by the Cabinet before the external audit of the accounts starting in July 2012.

**8.0 Consultations**

Leader of Council  
Portfolio Holder – Performance  
Service Managers

**9.0 Access to Information**

Council Agenda/Minutes  
Council Budget Book

## REPORT TO CABINET

<b>Open</b>		Would Any Decisions Proposed :		
<b>Any especially affected Wards None</b>	Mandatory	(A) Be Entirely Within Cabinet's Powers To Decide      Yes		
		(B) Need To Be Recommendations To Council              NO		
		(c) Be partly for recommendations to Council and partly within Cabinet's powers              NO		
Lead Member: Councillor Nick Daubney E-mail: cllr.nick.daubney@west-norfolk.gov.uk		Other Cabinet Members consulted:		
		Other Members consulted:		
Lead Officer: Lorraine Gore E-mail: lorraine.gore@west-norfolk.gov.uk Direct Dial: 01553 616432		Other Officers consulted: Management Team		
Financial Implications YES	Policy/Personnel Implications NO	Statutory Implications (incl S.17) NO	Equal Opportunities Implications NO	Risk Management Implications YES

**Date of meeting:            19 June 2012**

### **3            Capital Programme and Resources 2011-2013**

#### **Summary**

The report provides details of the outturn of the 2011/2012 capital programme and outlines amendments and rephrasing to the spending on schemes, revising the programme for 2012/2013. The capital programme outturn for 2011/2012 totalled £5,542,502 against an approved budget of £6,211,930. It has been necessary to rephrase a total of £852,990 of scheme costs to 2012/2013.

Capital receipts generated in the year totalled £692,288 of which £683,427 were useable.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1) that Cabinet note the outturn of the capital programme for 2011/2012 of £5,542,502.
- 2) that the financing arrangements for the 2011/2012 capital programme be approved;
- 3) that Cabinet approve the revised 2012/2013 capital programme of £8,119,370 as detailed in the report.
- 4) that a detailed review of the 2012-2015 capital programme and resources be undertaken as detailed in the report and a report presented to the 30 October 2012 Cabinet.

#### **Reason for Decision**

To report the outturn 2011/2012 for the Capital Programme and update members on capital spending and resources for 2012-2015.



## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report presents the outturn of the 2011/2012 capital programme and provides details of amendments and rephasing resulting from under and overspends and their impact on the 2012/2013 programme. The report also outlines the financing of the 2011/2012 programme.

## **2 Capital Programme 2011/2012**

- 2.1 The full capital programme for 2011/2012 is shown at Appendix 1 and provides details of the outturn for individual schemes, together with amendments and rephasing to/from 2012-2013.
- 2.2 A full updated Capital Programme 2011/2012 of £6,211,930 was reported at the Cabinet meeting on 7 February 2012 and approved by Council on 23 February 2012. Since that date there have been no further amendments.
- 2.3 The final figures for the outturn on the capital programme show that it will be necessary to carry forward a further £852,990 as schemes carry over to future years. In a number of cases there were over or under spends which net to an £183,559 overspend across the overall capital programme. A net reduction of £230,458 is reported on those schemes which require funding within the overall capital programme and this underspend will not be carried forward. The main schemes where underspends are reported include ICT programme (£60,000) staffing costs for data cleansing for planning geographical information met from revenue; smaller regeneration projects (£51,000) and the overall NORA project (£101,000). In addition there are a number of over and under spends across the schemes which come with resources ie reserves or unsupported borrowing, which totalled £414,017 over spend. This overspend will reduce the level of reserves. The main expenditure (£329,192) is in respect of affordable housing schemes that are fully funded from developer contributions/second homes funding which are held in reserves; improvement works at the ferry (£29,689) funded from S106 funding held in reserves and new trade waste software (£48,680) funded from revenue contribution. The table below shows the summary of the programme and actual spend to 31 March 2012. The detailed outturn for the Capital Programme 2011/2012 is presented at Appendix 1.

Table 1

	2011/2012 Budget	2011/2012 Outturn	Rephase To/(From) 2012/2013	2011/2012 Variance and Amend- ments
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Community and Democracy	1,403	1,205	262	64
Environment Improvement and Protection	515	455	34	(26)
Housing	1,199	1,258	241	300
Performance & Resources	1,040	954	122	36
Regeneration	2,004	1,635	179	(190)
Safer and Healthy Communities	51	37	15	1
<b>Capital Programme Outturn</b>	<b>6,212</b>	<b>5,544</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>185</b>
Safer, Stronger Communities Fund (Net of Third Party Contributions)	0	(1)	0	(1)
<b>Total Capital Programme Expenditure to be Funded 2011/2012</b>	<b>6,212</b>	<b>5,543</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>184</b>

2.4 The outturn 2011/2012 summarised in Table 1 above includes an additional line showing minor residual capital expenditure against the former Safer, Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF).

2.5 The main areas for the proposed rephasing are detailed below. The detailed outturn is presented at Appendix 1.

## Community and Democracy

### **Play Activities**

A number of projects are ongoing and the balance of the budget provision of £43,700 is to be carried forward to 2012/2013 to meet the cost of the works.

### **Car Parks – Replacement of pay and display machines**

The pay and display machines across all the Borough car parks will need to be replaced. This work will be undertaken on a phased basis and the total replacement cost will be around £250,000. It has been recommended to transfer additional resources to reserves as part of the revenue closedown (see separate report on the agenda). The budget provision of £75,000 is to be carried forward to 2012/2013.

### **St James Pool – UV Water Treatment**

These works are now due to be completed in 2012/2013 and budget provision of £24,000 is to be carried forward to meet the cost of the works.

### **St James Pool – Removal of Asbestos**

This work was undertaken during the beginning of April 2012 and is now complete. The balance of the budget provision of £59,400 is to be carried forward to 2012/2013 to meet the costs.

## Environmental Improvement and Protection

### **Public Conveniences - Refurbishment**

The balance of the budget provision of £27,500 is planned for the ongoing programme of refurbishment work and is to be carried forward to 2012/2013 to meet the cost of the works.

## Housing

### **Mandatory Assistance, Community Alarms and Assistive Technologies and Private Sector Renewal Assistance**

These budgets are committed for grant applications that are either approved but the works are not yet complete or the applications are being assessed. The remaining budget provision of £237,000 is to be carried forward to 2012/2013.

### **External Solid Wall Insulation Scheme**

Government grant of £1.1m has been approved for a joint scheme with Fenland District Council over 2 years. This budget is the Council's contribution which will be released to Fenland at stages as the works complete. It is proposed that the balance of the budget of £15,000 be carried forward to 2012/2013 to meet anticipated costs.

## Performance and Resources

### **ICT Development Programme**

A number of ICT projects have not progressed during 2011/2012 as originally planned. It is proposed to rephase budget provision of £95,950 to 2012/2013, mainly for the continued work on the Revenues and Benefits shared services, the desktop refresh and a contingency sum for additional requests as approved by the ICT Development Group.

### Regeneration

#### **Hunstanton Regeneration**

It is proposed to carry forward the balance of the budget provision to meet the cost of on-going projects and preparation of the Hunstanton High Street redevelopment scheme. Additional budget provision of £30,000 has been transferred to this scheme from the small regeneration projects budget. It is proposed to rephase £85,700 to 2012/2013 to meet the costs of the works.

#### **Regeneration Projects**

Remaining budget provision for the following schemes of £291,150 will be carried forward to 2012/2013 to meet the on-going costs of the projects:

College of West Anglia – grant funding new technology block - £140,450

King's Lynn waterfront small regeneration projects - £52,000

NORA – community facilities, project costs - £98,700

#### **Joint Venture**

Budget provision of £338,000 is included in the 2012/2013 programme for costs of the joint venture – costs of £195,000 have been incurred in 2011/2012 which have been met by bringing budget provision back as part of closedown.

- 2.6 Total capital receipts generated in 2011/2012 from preserved right to buy sales of former council houses, land sales, sale of vehicles, repayment of grants and mortgage principal repayments were £692,288. Mortgage principal payments and repayments of discount on former council house sales are subject to pooling and 75% is repaid to the Government (£8,861 in 2011/2012). The useable element of the capital receipts was £683,427. The table below shows the summary of useable capital receipts generated in 2011/2012.

Table 2

	<b>2011/2012 Budget £'000</b>	<b>2011/2012 Outturn £'000</b>
Council Houses Preserved Right to Buy		275
General Fund - Land	1,2	254
Sale of vehicles		53
Repayment of Grants		94
Mortgage Principal Repayments		7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,3</b>	<b>683</b>

- 2.7 The general fund sales originally anticipated to complete in 2011/2012 are now expected to be achieved during 2012/2013.

### **3 Financing of the Capital Programme 2011/2012**

- 3.1 The following table details the sources of finance used to fund capital spending during the year. The strategy adopted in financing is designed to make full use of all specific grants and thereby protect future allocations. Funding is taken from capital and revenue reserves for those specific schemes identified with resources. The strategy is then to make full use of useable capital receipts and the balance of funding to be taken from capital and revenue reserves.

Table 3

	<b>£</b>
<b>Total Capital Programme Outturn to be Funded 2011/2012</b>	<b>5,542,502</b>
<b>Sources of Finance:</b>	
Specific Capital Grant	670,1
Unsupported Borrowing	705,9
Capital Reserves	3,742,06
Capital Grants and Contributions	358,8
Capital Receipts	683,4
Revenue Contributions	237,8
Capital Creditors	(906,203)
Capital Prepayments	69,732

Capital Debtors	35,190
Capital Advance Receipts	(54,635)
<b>Total</b>	<u><u>5,542,502</u></u>

- Specific capital grants are those for Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) – paid directly from Government as a contribution to the costs of the DFGs.
- Unsupported Borrowing is that level of loans taken on by the Council and paid from within the budgets of services. During 2011/2012 unsupported borrowing was used to purchase vehicles and equipment where previously lease payments were made. In effect the lease payments now pay the debt charge. No help is available from Government to pay the costs – therefore they are classed as unsupported.
- Capital Reserves have been previously set aside for particular schemes, in some cases regular annual contributions are made to the reserves (e.g. sports and arts facilities, offices). Following the housing stock transfer the Council receives a share of the VAT recovered by Freebridge Community Housing from the housing improvement works. The capital estimates approved in February 2012 included for £2.2m from the VAT shelter reserve to be used to fund capital expenditure in 2011/2012.
- Capital grants and contributions are amounts held in reserves for affordable housing schemes and S106 funds.
- Capital Receipts come from the sale of assets and the preserved rights from the sale of former council houses.
- The Council no longer makes an annual revenue contribution to capital outlay. As part of the closedown of the Council's revenue budget 2011/2012 (see separate report on the agenda) it is proposed to make a revenue contribution to capital of £237,850 to fund a number of schemes including the installation of solar panels at Lynnsport and King's Court (£143,000) as recommended in the delegated decision report.

3.2 The capital debtors and creditors represent payments that will be made or received during 2012/2013. The net sum is actually funded from capital reserves when payments are made/income received in 2012/2013.

#### **4 Minimum Revenue Provision**

- 4.1 A requirement of capital controls is that details of the minimum revenue provision (MRP) calculation are reported to Cabinet. The MRP is the minimum amount that must be charged to the Council's revenue accounts each year as a provision to repay debt. Changes to the basis of calculating MRP were made by the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2008. A local authority is required to calculate an amount of MRP which they consider to be prudent, prepare a statement of its policy on making MRP and submit it to full Council. The Treasury Management Strategy 2011-2014 approved at Council on 28 April 2011 set out the policy proposals for the Borough for 2011/2012.
- 4.2 The amount of MRP charged to the accounts in 2011/2012 is £416,433 against a budget of £410,000. The actual MRP charge 2011/2012 has been calculated in accordance with the Council's policy based on the capital financing requirement as at 1 April 2011.

#### **5 Capital Programme 2012/2013**

- 5.1 The Capital Programme 2012/2013 of £10,264,180 was approved by Council on 23 February 2012. As detailed at section 2 above, it is proposed to carry forward budget provision of £852,990 from 2011/2012 to 2012/2013.
- 5.2 The following amendments have been included in the capital programme 2012/2013 summarised in Table 4 below and detailed at Appendix 2:

Replacement surface to the Lynnsport 3G pitch – delegated decision 15 May 2012. Budget provision of £28,600 has been included in the 2012/2013 programme, funded from reserves, to meet the contribution to the replacement costs.

Works to remove asbestos and replace ductwork at St James Swimming and Fitness Centre were approved at Cabinet on 6 December 2011. The total costs were estimated at £140,000 however at that time the capital programme was only amended by £89,000. The additional budget of £51,000 has been included in the 2012/2013 programme, funded from reserves.

A budget transfer of £20,000 has been made from the purchase of development sites scheme (£850,000) to meet the installation costs for a lift to one of the Council's shops required to secure future tenants.

- 5.3 As part of the closedown of the revenue accounts a number of transfers to reserves have been made to fund capital projects (see separate report on the agenda). These are summarised in Table 4 below and included in the 2012/2013 programme detailed at Appendix 2.

Table 4

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Budget £</b>
Lynnsport 3G Pitch – Replacement Surface	28,600
St James' Swimming Pool and Fitness Centre – Asbestos removal works	51,000
Council Shops – Lift Installation	20,000
Purchase Development Sites	(20,000)
Car Parks – Pay and Display Machines	175,000
Walks – Automatic Watering System	20,000
Crowd Control Barriers	12,000
Recycling Bins	25,000
Communal Waste Containers	10,000
Town Centre Signage	25,000
Pontoons	12,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>359,100</b>

- 5.4 The opportunity has been taken to review schemes included in the original programme for 2012/2013. Where it is now anticipated that these projects will not be undertaken during this period the budgets will be rephased to future years of the capital programme. The priority of these schemes will be subject to the detailed review of all schemes as set out in section 7 below. A total of £3,356,900 will be rephased as summarised in Table 5 and removed from the 2012/2013 programme as detailed at Appendix 2.

Table 5

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Budget £</b>	<b>Budget £</b>
Guildhall - Re Roofing		198,000
Resort - Refurb Crazy Golf Course		18,500
Arts Centre - Replacement Fire Alarm system		40,000
Lynnsport - Roof Repairs		100,000
Street lighting - Tuesday/Saturday market places KL		20,400
Purchase development sites		830,000
New Grounds Maintenance Nursery Hardwick Narrows		250,000
NORA - Utilities		1,900,000
Bus Station Improvements	500,000	
<i>S106 Contribution</i>	(500,000)	0
Town Centre Public Realm	100,000	
<i>S106 Contribution</i>	(100,000)	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,356,900</b>



- 5.5 Table 6 shows in summary form the proposed programme 2012/2013 after allowing for rephasing and amendments. Details of the individual schemes for 2012/2013 are given at Appendix 2.

Table 6

	<b>2012/2013 £'000</b>
Community and Democracy	1,469
Environmental Improvement and Protection	526
Housing General Fund	2,111
Performance and Resources	899
Regeneration	3,095
Safer and Healthy Communities	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,119</b>

## **6 Capital Resources 2012-2013**

- 6.1 Table 7 below provides details of the revised estimated capital resources for 2012/2013 updated after funding the 2011/2012 capital programme, and including amendments and rephasing as detailed above. The estimated resources available for future years will be reviewed and updated as part of the detailed review of the 10 year capital programme (see section 7 below).

Table 7

	<b>2012/2013 £'000</b>
<b>Sources of Finance:</b>	
Specific Capital Grants	577
Capital Receipts Housing	150
Capital Receipts General Fund	2,315
Temporary Borrowing	1,499
Resources for Specific Schemes	2,021
<b>Reserves:</b>	
Capital Reserves	137
VAT Shelter	1,420
<b>Total Resources Available</b>	<b>8,119</b>
<b>Revised Capital Programme</b>	<b>8,119</b>
<b>(Available)/Shortfall in Funding</b>	<b>0</b>

6.2 The funding for the period 2012/2013 was agreed by Council in 23 February 2012. The above table does contain some changes. Where schemes within the programme have been rephased the funding has followed and the figures changed accordingly. The capital receipts have been reviewed and include those sales anticipated to complete during 2012/2013.

## **7. 10 Year Capital Programme 2012/2022**

7.1 As detailed earlier in the report the actual amount of capital receipts achieved in 2011/2012 was well below target, although it is anticipated that the sales expected in 2011/2012 will complete during 2012/2013. The capital receipts target for 2012/2013 has been reduced from £4.8 million (as reported to Cabinet in February 2012) to £2.3 million (which represents 29% of the overall capital financing). Given the current economic climate it is not expected that the flow of capital receipts will improve, and any further reduction will have an impact on the ability to deliver the current capital programme.

7.2 It is proposed that the current 10 year capital programme will be subject to a detailed review of all schemes – operational and new developments/projects. The operational schemes in the 2012/2013 will proceed as approved, future years will be subject to the review. All new major developments/projects will be reviewed – no commitments for future capital expenditure to be made pending the review.

7.3 The review will be undertaken in accordance with the criteria and timetable as set out at Appendix 3.

## **8. Equality Impact Assessment**

8.1 The Council has a statutory requirement to carry out Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) as part of the service planning and policy proposal processes. This includes significant policy or significant changes to a service and includes potential capital bids, revenue growth bids and proposed reductions in service.

8.2 The Council may be required to carry out an impact assessment if the proposal impacts on any of the following:

- Equalities (including impact on issues of race, gender, disability, religion, sexual orientation, age)
- Community cohesion (whether there is a potential positive or negative impact on relations between different communities)

## **9 Financial Implications**

9.1 The financing arrangements for the capital programme are within budget. Where rephasing to/from 2012/2013 is to be made then the funding will follow. As previously noted the MRP charge for 2011/2012 can be met from within the overall revenue outturn for the year.

9.2 The revenue implications of all capital schemes will be met from within existing budgets.

## 10. Risk Implications and Sensitivity Analysis

10.1 Risk is inherent in any projection of future funding. The estimated resources available to fund the capital programme 2012-2013 and the risk implications and sensitivity/consequences are detailed in the table below. The level of risk is based on the impact on the funding of the capital programme if the resources are not achieved at the estimated level or at the time expected. .

Source of Funding	Risk Implications and Sensitivity	Level of Risk
Capital Grant	<p><b>Risk</b> The capital grant and specific grant included in the resources is a contribution towards housing capital expenditure and Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG). The level of grant included for 2012/2013 is based on the confirmed level of grant. The level of grant is confirmed by Central Government annually and can vary from year to year.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity/Consequences</b> This funding represents 7% of total general fund resources in 2012/2013.</p>	Low
Capital Receipts	<p><b>Risk</b> Capital receipts represent over 29% of the general fund resources available. The actual amount and timing of capital receipts can vary significantly. The achievement of capital receipts is monitored and reported in the monthly monitoring reports to ensure no over commitment.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity/Consequences</b> Capital receipts represent a high proportion of the total general fund resources available to fund the capital programme. The actual level of capital receipts that are achieved is sensitive to market conditions including demand for land and buildings, values and interest rates. The sum total of capital receipts included in the funding table of £2.3m is a challenging target in the current economic climate. In the event that capital receipts are not achieved at the level or within the year estimated it may be necessary to take on additional temporary borrowing at the prevailing interest rates.</p>	High

<p>Unsupported Borrowing</p>	<p><b>Risk</b> The proposed capital programme 2012-2013 includes unsupported borrowing for the purchase of equipment and vehicles.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity/Consequences</b> The Council will enter into unsupported borrowing where it can demonstrate that financial savings can be achieved by outright purchase of equipment, as opposed to the use of an operating lease and the payment of an annual lease.</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Source of Funding</p>	<p><b>Risk Implications and Sensitivity</b></p>	<p>Level of Risk</p>
<p>Temporary Borrowing</p>	<p><b>Risk</b> Temporary borrowing is included for cash flow purposes to ensure a balanced funding of the capital programme in each of the financial years and in advance of capital receipts.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity/Consequences</b> The actual required temporary borrowing will depend on the cash flow of spending and income from capital receipts achieved in the year. Temporary borrowing will be maintained at the minimum level required and reported as part of the outturn. The cost of funding the temporary borrowing is included in the revenue budget and is confirmed as affordable.</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Reserves</p>	<p><b>Risk</b> Contributions from reserves are based on actual balances as at 1 April 2012. In the case of the VAT Shelter, the Council receives a share of the VAT recovered by Freebridge Community Housing from housing improvement works. The monies are held in reserve and will be used to fund capital expenditure. The amounts included in the resources for the period 2012-2013 are based on the continuing programme of improvement works being carried out towards the decent homes standard.</p> <p><b>Sensitivity/Consequences</b> The reserves are available and as such the sensitivity is low. In the case of the VAT Shelter there is a contractual agreement between the Borough and Freebridge Community Housing for the sharing of VAT reclaimed.</p>	<p>Low</p>

10.2 Experience shows that the costs of schemes can also vary. Expenditure on the capital programme is included as part of the monthly monitoring report. Any significant variations on individual schemes will be reported and appropriate action taken

**11 Policy Implications**

The establishment and management of the capital programme is in accordance with the Council's Capital Strategy 2009.

**12 Statutory Consideration**

None

**13 Consultations**

Management Team

**14 Access to Information**

Cabinet Reports  
Background Papers (Government Circulars etc)  
Financial Plan 2011-2015  
Monthly Monitoring Reports 2011/2012

**Capital Programme 2012-2013**

Scheme Title	Amended Programme 2012/2013	Rephasing (to)/from 2011/2012	Rephasing to future years	amend- ments	Revised Programme 2012/2013
	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Community and Democracy</b>					
Guildhall - Re Roofing	198,000		(198,000)		
Town Hall / Archive	50,000	(9,300)			40,700
Community and Culture Community Grants in Rural Areas (including MUGA)	74,000				74,000
Lynnsport - Bowls Hall lighting	17,000	(300)			16,700
Lynnsport - Surface Water Drainage					
Play Activities		43,700			43,700
Refurbish Sports Pavilions		3,450			3,450
D/ham Market Leisure Ctr - Refurbishment		2,800			2,800
Public Art - Maritime Trail	10,000				10,000
Pay & Display Machine Replacement		75,000		175,000	250,000
Car Parks - Counting Machine - Kings Lynn	10,000				10,000
Car Parks - Counting Machine - Hunstanton	10,000				10,000
Resort - Refurb Crazy Golf Course	18,500		(18,500)		
Corn Exchange - Emergency Lights	19,500				19,500
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>407,000</b>	<b>115,350</b>	<b>(216,500)</b>	<b>175,000</b>	<b>480,850</b>
<b>Community and Democracy (contd)</b>					
<b>Schemes which come with Resources</b>					
Arts Centre - Replacement Fire Alarm system	53,600		(40,000)		13,600
Public Art		3,500			3,500
Corn Exchange - Replace refrigerant and software		6,000			6,000
Grounds Maintenance Equipment	34,440				34,440
Grounds Maintenance Vehicles	123,050				123,050
Cherry Picker					
Walks - Automatic Watering System				20,000	20,000
Hunstanton Car Parks and Resort Services Vehicle					
KL off street car parks - vehicles					
Lynnsport - Car Park & Path Repairs	46,000	(1,650)			44,350
Lynnsport - G3 pitch				28,600	28,600
Lynnsport - Refurbish Dance Studio		4,600			4,600
D/ham Market Leisure Ctr -Floor/Surface Resealing - Main Hall/Dance Studio		10,000			10,000
St James - Pool Plant - UV Water Treatment		24,000			24,000
St James Pool - Replacement automatic entrance doors and windows		11,800			11,800
St James Pool - Removal of Asbestos		59,400		51,000	110,400
St James Pool - Replace Air Handling Unit		2,000			2,000
Lynnsport - Folding chairs refurb/replacement		2,400			2,400
Lynnsport - Replacement PA system	30,000				30,000

<b>Capital Programme 2012-2013</b>					
<b>Scheme Title</b>	<b>Amended Programme 2012/2013</b>	<b>Rephasing (to)/from 2011/2012</b>	<b>Rephasing to future years</b>	<b>amendments</b>	<b>Revised Programme 2012/2013</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<b><u>Community and Democracy (contd)</u></b>					
Lynnsport - Roof Repairs	100,000		(100,000)		
Corn Exchange - Repair loading bay paving		9,850			9,850
Arts Centre Roof Repairs	32,500				32,500
Car Parks - Resurfacing	82,350				82,350
Downham Market Leisure Centre - Replace Dryside Windows	20,000				20,000
Play Areas - Replacement Equipment	30,000				30,000
St James Pool - Combined Heat and Power	80,000				80,000
Lynnsport - Floor/Surface Replacement -	108,000				108,000
Lynnsport - Replacement of Grounds Maintenance	10,000				10,000
Lynnsport - Fire Alarm System Upgrade	10,000				10,000
Corn Exchange - replace moving lights					
Corn Exchange - Replace rooftop chiller unit	60,000	5,000			65,000
Corn Exchange - Replace Followspots	10,000				10,000
Leisure Card - Replacement Card Printers		10,000			10,000
Leisure Card - Gladstone server Platform Upgrade	30,000				30,000
Lynnsport - Sports Hall - Retractable Dividing Wall	10,000				10,000
Crowd Control Barriers				12,000	12,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>869,940</b>	<b>146,900</b>	<b>(140,000)</b>	<b>111,600</b>	<b>988,440</b>
<b>Total Community and Democracy</b>	<b>1,276,940</b>	<b>262,250</b>	<b>(356,500)</b>	<b>286,600</b>	<b>1,469,290</b>
<b><u>Environmental Improvement and Protection</u></b>					
Public Conveniences - Improvements		27,500			27,500
Recycling - Wheeled bins		6,540			6,540
Street lighting - Tuesday/Saturday market places KL	30,400		(20,400)		10,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>30,400</b>	<b>34,040</b>	<b>(20,400)</b>		<b>44,040</b>
<b><u>Schemes which come with Resources</u></b>					
Public Cleansing Sweepers/vehicles	261,440				261,440
Recycling Vehicles					
Neighbourhood Teams vehicles and equipment	185,300				185,300
Recycling Bins				25,000	25,000
Communal Food Waste Containers				10,000	10,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>446,740</b>			<b>35,000</b>	<b>481,740</b>
<b>Total Environmental Improvement and Protection</b>	<b>477,140</b>	<b>34,040</b>	<b>(20,400)</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>525,780</b>

<b>Capital Programme 2012-2013</b>					
<b>Scheme Title</b>	<b>Amended Programme 2012/2013</b>	<b>Rephasing (to)/from 2011/2012</b>	<b>Rephasing to future years</b>	<b>amendments</b>	<b>Revised Programme 2012/2013</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>Housing General Fund</b>					
Essential Repairs (including Disabled Facilities Grants)	1,369,600	221,000			1,590,600
Community Alarms and Assistive Technologies	90,000	(8,500)			81,500
Estate Roads - Repairs (former HRA)	10,500				10,500
STW Refurb/connect to public sewer	230,000	(5,800)			224,200
STW decommission redundant sites/Refurb pumping stations	25,000				25,000
Sewerage Infrastructure & surface water drains/ditches	18,800	6,200			25,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1,743,900</b>	<b>212,900</b>			<b>1,956,800</b>
<b>Schemes which come with Resources</b>					
Careline - replacement vehicles	11,000	(11,000)			
External Solid Wall Insulation Scheme	85,000	15,000			100,000
Private Sector Renewal	29,400	24,500			53,900
Affordable Housing Schemes					
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>125,400</b>	<b>28,500</b>			<b>153,900</b>
<b>Total Housing General Fund</b>	<b>1,869,300</b>	<b>241,400</b>			<b>2,110,700</b>
<b>Performance and Resources</b>					
DDA stage 2 works	95,000	(1,100)			93,900
Health and Safety - Council Facilities		22,900			22,900
Stock Condition Priority Works	329,500	(10,200)			319,300
ICT Development Programme	213,000	95,950			308,950
Derelict Land and Buildings - Compulsory Purchase	40,000				40,000
Investment in General Properties				20,000	20,000
Purchase development sites	850,000		(830,000)	(20,000)	
New Nursery Hardwick Narrows	250,000		(250,000)		
Decommission flood warning sirens	30,000				30,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1,807,500</b>	<b>107,550</b>	<b>(1,080,000)</b>		<b>835,050</b>
<b>Schemes which come with Resources</b>					
ICT Microsoft Enterprise Agreement	50,000				50,000
King's Lynn Depot - Fencing		14,200			14,200
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>14,200</b>			<b>64,200</b>
<b>Total Performance and Resources</b>	<b>1,857,500</b>	<b>121,750</b>	<b>(1,080,000)</b>		<b>899,250</b>



<b>Capital Programme 2012-2013</b>					
<b>Scheme Title</b>	<b>Amended Programme 2012/2013</b>	<b>Rephasing (to)/from 2011/2012</b>	<b>Rephasing to future years</b>	<b>amendments</b>	<b>Revised Programme 2012/2013</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>Regeneration</b>					
Conservation Area review & character appraisal project	10,800				10,800
Hunstanton Regeneration Works to Oldsunway Bridge	20,000	85,700			85,700
					20,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>30,800</b>	<b>85,700</b>			<b>116,500</b>
<b>Growth Point and King's Lynn Regeneration</b>					
Smaller Regeneration Projects	50,000				50,000
COWA	1,255,000	140,450			1,395,450
Bus Station Improvements	500,000		(500,000)		
S106 Contribution	(500,000)		500,000		
Net Expenditure					
Car Park Signage	190,000				190,000
S106 Contribution	(190,000)				(190,000)
Net Expenditure					
Town centre Public Realm	100,000		(100,000)		
S106 Contribution	(100,000)		100,000		
Net Expenditure					
Town Centre Signage	50,000			25,000	75,000
S106 Contribution	(50,000)				(50,000)
Net Expenditure				25,000	25,000
Tuesday Market Place Refurb	75,000	(3,400)			71,600
King's Lynn Waterfront/Regeneration Projects		52,000			52,000
Pontoons	150,000			12,500	162,500
<b>Nar Ouse Regeneration Area</b>					
External Project Management / Environmental Advice					
Remediation	120,000	19,000			139,000
MUGA (Includes Land)	50,000	9,000			59,000
Millenium Community Construction	100,000	60,000			160,000
Utilities	2,000,000	(76,800)	(1,900,000)		23,200
Landscape & Maintenance	310,000	12,500			322,500
Nar Ouse Way Widening		10,000			10,000
Other Project Costs	100,000	65,000			165,000
Net Total Nar Ouse Regeneration Area	2,680,000	98,700	(1,900,000)		878,700
Joint Venture	338,000	(195,000)			143,000
Water Attenuation					
Derelict Land/Buildings - bring back into use/visual image	200,000				200,000
<b>Sub Total Growth Point and King's Lynn Regeneration</b>	<b>4,748,000</b>	<b>92,750</b>	<b>(1,900,000)</b>	<b>37,500</b>	<b>2,978,250</b>
<b>Total Regeneration</b>	<b>4,778,800</b>	<b>178,450</b>	<b>(1,900,000)</b>	<b>37,500</b>	<b>3,094,750</b>

<b>Capital Programme 2012-2013</b>					
<b>Scheme Title</b>	<b>Amended Programme 2012/2013</b>	<b>Rephasing (to)/from 2011/2012</b>	<b>Rephasing to future years</b>	<b>amend-ments</b>	<b>Revised Programme 2012/2013</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>Safer and Healthy Communities</b>					
Gayton Rd Cemetery - Extension		1,900			1,900
Mintlyn Crematorium - Front of House improvements	4,500				4,500
<b>Sub Total</b>	4,500	1,900			6,400
Schemes which come with Resources					
Mintlyn Crematorium - Book of Remembrance Room Refurb		13,200			13,200
<b>Sub Total</b>		13,200			13,200
<b>Total Safer and Healthy Communities</b>	4,500	15,100			19,600
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>10,264,180</b>	<b>852,990</b>	<b>(3,356,900)</b>	<b>359,100</b>	<b>8,119,370</b>

### Capital Programme Criteria/Timetable

#### Background

The Council is in a position where it cannot maintain its capital programme at the level it previously set over a 10 year period 2012/2022. The dramatic fall off of sales of land for housing developments and the current cautious conditional contracts for sale of commercial land means that capital receipts are at an all-time low and at present the position does not appear to be improving.

The Council will continue to drive forward a capital programme but it must take a more flexible approach and revise its ambitions to match funding availability. This note looks at a set of criteria that could be used to prioritise schemes that will be included in the revised capital programme 2012/2022. The note also sets out a timetable for the production and approval of the programme. In the event that either the economy begins to pick up and land sales consequently increase, or that government begins to turn the capital funding tap back on, the programme can be further revised.

#### Facts/Issues

The new Corporate Business Plan looks at five outcomes;

- Growing Economy
- Quality Environment
- Maximizing Peoples' Potential
- Safe and Healthy Lives
- Thriving Communities

All of the above are of equal importance in the Plan.

Return on Investment is also a criteria that would fit the new approach of the Council in terms of looking for value for money. This could include leveraging in or unlocking public and private investment

As in previous sets of criteria used for the capital programme in addition to the above the issues of operational necessities, including Health and Safety and planned maintenance are also outcomes and criteria that should be used to judge scheme bids.

Financing the programme will prove difficult and therefore although the above criteria would help to evaluate and prioritise schemes the process should be supported by a rationale that includes:

- Doing things the market will not do
- Not doing things the market will do anyway
- Increasing supply when demand is unmet
- Creating demand if necessary

## Proposals

It is proposed that any bids made on the capital programme should be judged and scored by Management Team against the criteria set out below;

- Growing Economy
- Quality Environment
- Maximizing Peoples' Potential
- Safe and Healthy Lives
- Thriving Communities
- Operational Necessity
- Return on Investment

Each bid will be scored by awarding up to 10 points to each element. Top scores will then be reviewed and unless amended they will form the priority order for recommended inclusion in the capital programme.

## Timetable for production and Approval of Capital Programme

The following sets out a timetable for the production and approval process:

12 June	Resources and Performance Panel - Closedown of 2011/2012 and revised 2012/2013 programme including rephasing
16 June	Discussion with Cabinet Members on draft criteria and saving system.
19 June	Cabinet – Closedown of 2011/2012 and revised 2012/2013 programme including rephasing Panel and Cabinet report to include section on suspending current capital programme 2013-2022 pending full review.
31 July	Cabinet report on enterprise centre scheme Chief Accountant to meet with service managers/Executive Directors to review all existing maintenance/operational schemes
August/Sept	Management Team will review updated capital programme against new set of criteria. New format to show Operational schemes and development/regeneration schemes separately. Any new bids will be settled as part of this process. Capital resources will be updated.
23 October	Resources and Performance Panel – Report on revised capital programme 3 year/10 year.
30 October	Cabinet - Report revised capital programme 3 year/10 year
<b>2013</b>	
29 Jan/5 Feb	Panel/Cabinet – Report on updated capital programme