

**SUBJECT: DRAFT CAPITAL BUDGET PROPOSALS 2018/19 TO 2021/22**

**MEETING: Stronger Communities Select**

**DATE: 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

**DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: Countywide**

**1. PURPOSE:**

1.1 To outline the proposed capital budget for 2018/19 and the indicative capital budgets for the three years 2019/20 to 2021/22.

**2 RECOMMENDATION (to be undertaken by Select Committee):**

2.1 To consider and provide feedback upon the capital budget assumptions and priorities affecting this Select portfolio area.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS: (presented to Cabinet 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov)**

2.2 That Cabinet issues its draft capital budget proposals for 2018/19 to 2021/22 for consultation purposes as set out and referred to in Appendix 2.

2.3 That Cabinet confirms a capital strategy, which seeks to prioritise the Council's existing Future Schools programme and other commitments whilst also continuing to finance a minimum core capital programme, recognizing the risks associated with this approach.

2.4 That Cabinet reaffirms the principle that new schemes can only be added to the programme if the business case demonstrates that they are self-financing or the scheme is deemed a higher priority than current schemes in the programme and therefore displaces it, and reviews capital priorities where appropriate.

2.4 That Cabinet agrees to maximize the use of capital receipts when received to fund the capital programme (therefore reducing the need to borrow) and/or set aside to repay debt as outlined in paragraph 3.11.

2.5 That Cabinet agrees to the sale of the assets in accordance with the Asset Management Plan and identified in the exempt background paper in order to support the capital programme, and that once agreed, no further options are considered for these assets.

### 3. KEY ISSUES:

#### Capital budget strategy

3.1 The capital MTFP strategy put in place in the face of an ever reducing resource base from Welsh Government has been reviewed. The strategy going forward has the following key components:

- The core MTFP capital programme needs to be financially sustainable without drawing on further funding.
- The completion of tranche A Future schools programme remains the most significant aspect of capital programme. No allowance has yet been made in relation to a tranche B programme that is currently being considered by Welsh Government.
- In 2017/18, the budget provided for a 1 year specific addition to Disabled Facilities Grants of £300k, to address backlog issues. Consequently the 2018/19 starting capital position excludes that sum, but the potential exists for members to consider such again during their budget deliberations. Cabinet has decided to include provision for £300k additional to £600k traditional budget for 2018-19 during their 22<sup>nd</sup> November meeting.
- No inflation increases will be applied to any of the capital programme with property maintenance budget and Infrastructure maintenance budget set at the same level as last year
- The County farms maintenance and reinvestment programme is based on the revised asset management plan for County farms, supported by the latest condition survey data
- Budget for Area Management of £20k in the programme could be further reduced or cut in the face of other pressures
- £1m unsupported prudential borrowing per annum has been contained in the programme for a number of years and this will continue in the current 4 year programme
- The provisional settlement maintains effectively a standstill funding position in respect of core capital grant and supported borrowing for 2018/19. This has presumed to continue through the later 3 years of MTFP.
- Budget to enhance or prepare assets for sale will be maintained and funded through the capital receipt regeneration reserve in order to maximize this funding stream for the Future schools programme priority, and whilst financial assumptions indicate sufficient resources to afford such expenditure in the years necessary, it is noticed that there is an increased needs for temporary

ad hoc borrow to compensate for delays in receipts. Such additional costs are not easily factored into the revenue budget, and appear in monitoring reports as increased actuals against budget.

## Capital MTFP issues

- 3.2 The four year capital programme is reviewed annually and updated to take account of any new information that is relevant.
- 3.3 The major component of the capital MTFP for the next few years is completion of the Council's Tranche A Future schools programme. Colleagues are working through options in relation to a future Welsh Government tranche B programme. No presumption has been made to add such costs into this next 4 year window as yet as costs of proposals and their affordability are still to be established.
- 3.4 As part of the 2017/18 budget setting process, Members identified 5 additional priorities that were uncosted at the time of budget setting, but for which they added an unhypothecated borrowing assumption of £500k per annum to the 2017/18 budget.
- 3.5 During this year, some of those scheme costs have crystallised and the following indicates the related presumption within the capital programme together with an indication of the revenue consequences. In all cases an asset life of 25 years has been presumed:
- Monmouth Pool – commitment to reprovide the pool in Monmouth as a consequence of the Future schools programme, £7.3 million project afforded by £1.9m Future schools programme, £985k sc106, core treasury funding of circa £835k, and 3.58million prudential borrowing afforded by the Leisure service through additional income predictions (MRP predicted to start in 2019/20)
  - Abergavenny Hub – commitment to reprovide the library with the One Stop Shop in Abergavenny to conclude the creation of a Hub in each of the towns. £2.3 million (MRP predicted to start in 2019/20)
  - Disabled Facilities Grants – the demand for grants is currently outstripping the budget, work is being undertaken to assess the level of investment required to maximize the impact and benefit for recipients. Members ultimately chose to put a 1 year commitment of £300k into base capital programme in 2017/18. Consequential to Cabinet meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov, the Executive has confirmed a wish to include £300k in financial modelling to continue to assist with DFG demand. For clarity the figures in this report reflect that addition.
  - City Deal - 10 Authorities in the Cardiff City region are looking at a potential £1.2 billion City Deal. Agreement to commit to this programme is being sought across the region in January and so would impact on the capital MTFP. The potential impact on individual authority budgets is currently being modelled in advance of decisions on specific projects and profiles in order for authorities to start reflecting the commitment in their MTFPs. The potential is for the 10 authorities to provide collectively £120 million over time, with individual contributions being reflective of populations. Our indicative liability during forthcoming capital MTFP is likely to be

### Contributions predicted during forthcoming MTFP window

Year	Amount
2018-19	£83k
2019-20	£482k
2020-21	£472k

2021-22            £729k

Contributions predicted following the MTFP window

2022-23            £729k

2023-24            £1207k

2024-25            £1206k

2025-26            £1206k

2026-27            £1206k

Total                £7320k

MRP is presumed to start in the year after the contribution is made.

- J and E Block – the office rationalization programme is being considered to see if there is a solution that would enable the Magor and Usk sites to be consolidated, releasing funding to pay for the necessary investment to bring the blocks into use. The current presumption included in Treasury figures is £1.4million expenditure with MRP starting in 2020/21. No revenue savings from central accommodation or Magor building have been presumed in the capital modelling, as those savings are unlikely to be realized until that building is vacated.

3.6 A strategy that enables the core programme, Future schools and the above schemes to be accommodated is being developed. Notwithstanding this there will still remain a considerable number of pressures that sit outside of any potential to fund them within the Capital MTFP and this has significant risk associated with it. Cabinet have previously accepted this risk.

3.7 The current policy is that further new schemes can only be added to the programme if the business case demonstrates that they are self financing or the scheme is deemed a higher priority than current schemes in the programme and therefore displaces it.

3.8 In summary the following other issues and pressures have been identified:

- Long list of back log pressures – infrastructure, property, DDA work, Public rights of way, as outlined in Appendix 1. None of these pressures are included in the current capital MTFP, but this carries with it a considerable risk.
- In addition to this there are various schemes/proposals (e.g. Alternative delivery model for Leisure, tourism and culture services, tranche B Future schools, any enhanced DFG spending, waste fleet vehicle replacement, community amenity site enhancement) that could also have a capital consequence, but in advance of quantifying those or having Member consideration of these items, they are also excluded from current capital MTFP.
- Capital investment required to deliver revenue savings – this is principally in the area of office accommodation, and social care, property investment and possibly Additional Learning needs. The level of investment is currently being assessed however, in accordance with the principle already set above, if the schemes are not going to displace anything already in the programme then the cost of any additional borrowing will need to be netted off the saving to be made.

- The IT reserve is depleted so funding for any major new IT investment is limited. Any additional IT schemes will need to either be able to pay for themselves or displace other schemes in the programme.
- Base interest rates increased by 0.25% to 0.5% yesterday (2/11/17). That pressure is more likely to be felt in the Revenue MTFP as it will increase the cost of borrowing over time, however it may also impact adversely upon the viability of capital business case developments and their ability to demonstrate self affordability. Given this very recent change, it hasn't been possible to fully work through the consequences in the initial revenue and capital MTFP. That will instead manifest itself through the budget setting process.

### Available capital resources

- 3.9 The capital strategy identified above establishes that the core programme will not increase so that available funding can be prioritised for the Future Schools Programme and other commitments provided.
- 3.10 In light of the current pressures on the Authority's medium-term revenue budget, and the principles on which any prudential borrowing must be taken of affordability, prudence and sustainability, the use of further prudential borrowing has to be carefully assessed.
- 3.11 The table below illustrates the balance on the useable capital receipts reserve over the period 2017/18 to 2021/22 taking into account current capital receipts forecasts provided by Estates and revised balances drawn to finance the existing programme. The Council still needs to continue to make a concerted effort to maximize its capital receipts generation over the next few years. Opportunities to set aside capital receipts to repay debt were included in last year's programme, but not able to be actioned, given a delay in receipts which conversely will result in additional costs of temporary borrowing. This is evident in the summary table below, where an artificial deficit in receipts is shown for 2018-19, when instead the balance will be zero, the difference being afforded by temporary borrowing. Further detail is provided in Appendix 4.

<b><u>GENERAL RECEIPTS</u></b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>Balance as at 31st March</b>	<b>18,931</b>	<b>5,315</b>	<b>(393)</b>	<b>4,662</b>	<b>9,817</b>	<b>9,474</b>

- 3.12 The above table illustrates that the capital receipts balance is set to reduce over the MTFP. This is dependent on the capital receipts forecasts provided materializing, which in itself is a significant risk, then being used to fund the capital programme. Experience suggests that there is often significant slippage in gaining receipts which may be due to factors outside the control of the Authority. The risk assessment on the receipts projected is contained in Appendix 5. It is crucial that once assets are identified and approved for sale that this decision is acted upon. Exploration of any alternative use of surplus assets needs to be undertaken before Council approves them for sale in order to assist in the capital planning process.

3.13 Opportunities to generate further receipts and funding streams in line with the Asset Management Plan are continuously being sought, these are outlined below:

- Review of accommodation/buildings in use by the council, with a view to further rationalization – some further rationalisation of office accommodation has been done, but there may be further potential leading to other buildings being released for sale and this is also key in identifying revenue savings
- Identification of services that can be combined as part of the whole Place agenda and establishment of community Hubs, and therefore release buildings for sale
- Review the existing County Farms strategy
- Community Infrastructure Levy – this will become more relevant for the capital MTFP if and when implemented and can include funding for more general ‘place-making’ schemes that support the growth proposed in the LDP e.g. sustainable transport improvements, upgrade/provision of Broadband connectivity, town centre improvements, education, strategic sports/adult recreation facilities and green infrastructure.

#### **4. REASONS:**

4.1 To provide an opportunity for consultation on the capital budget proposals.

#### **5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 Resource implications are noted throughout the report both in terms of how the core programme is financially sustainable, the key issues that require further quantification and also the risks associated with not addressing the pressures outlined in Appendix 1.

#### **6. FUTURE GENERATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 Capital budgets which impact on individuals with protected characteristics, most notably renovation grants and access for all budgets are being maintained at their current levels.

6.2 The equality impact of the mechanism to allocate maintenance budgets to individual schemes should be in place and being used to aid allocation of funding

6.3 The actual impacts from this report's recommendations will be reviewed on an ongoing basis by the Capital Working Group.

#### **7. SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING IMPLICATIONS**

None

**8. CONSULTEES:**

Senior Leadership Team  
All Cabinet Members  
Head of Legal Services  
Head of Finance

**9. APPENDICES:**

Appendix 1 – Capital MTFP pressures  
Appendix 2 – Capital budget summary programme 2018/19 to 2021/22  
Appendix 3 – Schools programme  
Appendix 4 – Forecast capital receipts 2017/18 to 2021/22  
Appendix 5 – Capital receipts risk factors  
Appendix 6 (exempt) – Forecast receipts  
Appendix 7 – Future Generations Evaluation

**10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

List of planned capital receipts: Exempt by virtue of s100 (D) of the Local Government Act 1972

**11. AUTHOR:**

Mark Howcroft – Assistant Head of Finance

**12. CONTACT DETAILS:**

Tel: (01633) 644740

Email: [markhowcroft@monmouthshire.gov.uk](mailto:markhowcroft@monmouthshire.gov.uk)



## Appendix 1 – Capital MTFP pressures

Description of Pressure	Forecast Cost	Date Updated	Responsible Officer / Champion
<p><b>Current Rights of Way issues (Whitebrook byway)</b> - Engineering assessments have been completed on landslip / collapse of byway at Whitebrook, estimated cost of repairs in the region of £70-£80k.</p>	75,000	Dec 16	Matthew Lewis
<p><b>Current Rights of Way issues (Wye and Usk Valley Walks)</b> - Engineering assessments have been completed on river erosion / landslips on the Wye and Usk Valley Walks. [Monmouth] (Wye Valley Walk) £23,925, [Clytha] (Usk Valley Walk) £46,725, [Coed Y Prior] (Usk Valley Walk) £9,900, site investigations/design £5,500.</p>	86,000	Dec 16	Matthew Lewis
<p><b>A major review of the waste Mgt and recycling service</b> is ongoing. Proposals are likely to include consideration of receptacles rather than bags (anticipated cost of between £0.3-1.3m) To accommodate the change at kerbside, developments will be needed at our transfer stations at an indicative cost of £800k depending on the scale of works required. Options may be limited if WG insist on certain scheme components. The quoted capital costs exclude new vehicle costs which are modelled as being leased currently.</p>	2,100,000	Dec 16	Roger Hoggins / Carl Touhig
<p><b>Monmouth Community Amenity site upgrade</b> - indicative costs are £1.5-2m if built and run by the Council. The transfer station and CA capital costs could be avoided if the Council decided it was best value to procure a build, finance, operate contract for its sites in future. The work to evaluate these options will follow on after kerbside collection.</p>	2,000,000	Dec 16	Roger Hoggins / Carl Touhig

Description of Pressure	Forecast Cost	Date Updated	Responsible Officer / Champion
<p><b>Property Maintenance requirements for both schools &amp; non-schools</b> as valued by condition surveys carried out some years ago. The existing £2m annual budget mainly targets urgent maintenance e.g. health &amp; safety, maintaining buildings wind &amp; watertight, etc., and is insufficient to address the maintenance backlog. A lack of funding means maintenance costs will rise; that our ability to sell buildings at maximum market rates will be affected ; Our ability to deliver effective services will be affected and a Loss of revenue and poor public image.</p>	22,000,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer
<p><b>Disabled adaptation works to public buildings</b> required under disability discrimination legislation.</p>	7,200,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer
<p><b>School Traffic Management Improvements</b> - based on works carried out on similar buildings.</p>	250,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer
<p><b>Refurbishment of all Public Toilets</b> - Capital investment required to facilitate remaining transfers to Town and Community Councils</p>	95,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer
<p><b>School fencing improvements</b></p>	68,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer/Headteachers
<p><b>Modification works to school kitchens to comply with Environmental Health Standards.</b> Without additional funding school kitchens may have to be closed and additional costs for transporting meals in incurred, possibly causing disruption to the education process.</p>	38,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer
<p><b>Radon remedial works</b> Following the commissioning of Radon Wales to carry Radon Surveys of public buildings, remedial works will be required at various premises to resolve issues</p>	75,000	Dec 16	Rob O'Dwyer

Description of Pressure	Forecast Cost	Date Updated	Responsible Officer / Champion
<p><b>Countryside Rights of Way work</b> needed to bring network up to statutorily required and safe standard. This should be taken as a provisional figure as surveys and assessments of bridges and structures are on-going and the rights of way prioritisation system which includes risk assessment will more accurately define and rank the backlog. Bridge management report on 787 bridges completed in October 2013 identifies 254 known bridge issues of which 77 need repair, 31 replacement &amp; 80 are missing. 68 have 'other' issues including 51 bridges which require full inspection to further ascertain requirements/costs. 13 bridges are 10m+ and require replacement or repair. It is not possible to cost all of these currently but a ball park figure of £288k has been identified for the first tranche of issues. Additional ROW allocation (30K) helping, but scale of overall pressure means these figures are still relevant</p>	2,200,000	Dec 16	Ian Saunders
<p><b>Transportation/safety strategy</b> –Air Quality Management, 20 m.p.h legislation and DDA (car parks)</p>	1,200,000	Dec 16	Richard Cope
<p><b>Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs)</b> - Other than last year, the DFG's budget has remained unchanged for the last ten years. Each year the fully committed/spent date falls earlier in the financial year.</p>	500,000	Dec 16	Ian Bakewell
<p><b>Bringing County highways to the level of a safe road network.</b> This backlog calculation figure has been provided by Welsh Government. The Authorities Capital Programme is not addressing the backlog significantly as the annual level of funding available is not of sufficient magnitude to address this. The annual programme is set in relation to the approved budget and this programme is shared with all members. Routes are selected on the basis of their significance within the overall highway network and their condition. Programmes are reviewed annually around December and then distributed to members.</p>	80,000,000	Dec 16	Roger Hoggins

Description of Pressure	Forecast Cost	Date Updated	Responsible Officer / Champion
<p><b>Investing in infrastructure projects needed to arrest road closures due to whole or partial bank slips.</b> Without additional expenditure there is the potential for deterioration, increased scheme costs, disruption to communities and the travelling public and road closures.</p>	5,000,000	Dec 16	Roger Hoggins
<p><b>Backlog on highways structures including old culverts, bridges and retaining walls.</b> With existing budget this backlog will take 23 years to cover and there will be increased likelihood of loss of network availability.</p>	12,700,000	Dec 16	Roger Hoggins
<p><b>Reprovision or repair of Chain Bridge</b> - Cost prediction is indicative at present. Summary quotes updated August 15. The bridge is currently under special management measures and inspection. Repair/ reprovision will remove / minimise the need for these measures. Without remedial work, the structure will continue to deteriorate. The current 40T maximum limit will have to be further reduced restricting access to the Lancayo area especially for heavy vehicles. Options evaluated from repairing sufficiently to maintain 40t limit, to converting to footbridge and reprovisioning</p>	1,800,000 to 7,500,000. Mid point 4,700,000	Dec 16	Roger Hoggins
<p><b>Caldicot Castle remedial works</b> - longer term pressures given the condition of the curtain walls / towers etc. The £2-3m estimate is a ball park figure ranging from just the backlog of maintenance to also including improvements to bring the visitor facilities up to modern standards. An RDP grant is paying for a condition survey / outline conservation plan. The current condition of buildings constrains current operations and will impact on future management options including the assessment of viability of potential Cultural Services Trust. Heritage Lottery Funding is possible (but very competitive) Substantial match funding would still be required.</p>	3,000,000	Dec 16	Ian Saunders
<p><b>Severn View Care Facility renewal</b></p>	?		Julie Boothroyd/ Ty Stokes
<p><b>Total Pressures</b></p>	<b>141,287,000</b>		

Description of Pressure	Forecast Cost	Date Updated	Responsible Officer / Champion
<b>Capital investment for revenue savings</b>			
<p><b>Leisure and cultural services</b> - Currently the service is exploring future delivery options including trust status. Part of the work will involve conditions surveys which may lead to capital works being required to expedite handover of assets. Included:- e.g. museums, Shire hall, Abergavenny castle, Old station Tintern, Caldicot castle; Have requested £30k from cabinet for work to review assets (15/10/14); Aim is also to reduce but not eliminate revenue; £400k per annum now. further down the line</p>	1,000,000	Dec 16	Ian Saunders
<p><b>ALN Strategy</b> - Mandate 35 of the MTFP 14/15 outlines a review of current ALN service that includes Mounton House. Options could require Capital Spend but this is unknown at the present time</p>	?		Will McLean/Nikki Wellington

## Appendix 2 – Capital budget summary programme 2018/19 to 2021/22

	Project Code	Total Budget 2017/18	Estimated Slippage From 2017/18	Indicative Budget 2018/19	Indicative Budget 2019/20	Indicative Budget 2020/21	Indicative Budget 2021/22
Property Maintenance	Various	1,635,797	0	1,889,552	1,889,552	1,889,552	1,889,552
Upgrade School Kitchens	98219	39,725	0	39,725	39,725	39,725	39,725
Usk County Hall E Block Major Refurb	90316	306,450	0	0			
Usk County Hall J Block Major Refurb	90317	0		1,400,000			
Caerwent House	90320	50,800	0	0			
Abergavenny Community Hub	90321	101,122	0	2,283,000			
Solar Farm - Oak Grove	90324	505,740	0	0			
<b>Asset Management Schemes</b>		<b>2,639,633</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,612,277</b>	<b>1,929,277</b>	<b>1,929,277</b>	<b>1,929,277</b>
Access for all	98621	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Monmouth High 21c school provision	96625	22,886,705	6,000,000	12,345,133	750,000	0	0
Caldicot High 21c school provision	96626	11,379,144	0	2,164,911	0	0	0
Welsh Medium 21c school provision	98640	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0
Monmouth Pool	98689	2,616,194	0	4,711,945	0	0	0
<b>School Development Schemes</b>		<b>37,932,043</b>	<b>6,000,000</b>	<b>19,271,989</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>
Footway Reconstruction	97205	349,445	0	190,453	190,453	190,453	190,453
Street Lighting Defect Column Programme	97210	175,000	0	171,408	171,408	171,408	171,408
Reconstruction of bridges & retaining walls	97215	500,000	0	449,041	449,041	449,041	449,041
Safety fence upgrades	97239	146,370	0	76,181	76,181	76,181	76,181
Signing upgrades & disabled facilities	97302	48,091	0	38,091	38,091	38,091	38,091
Flood Allievation Schemes	97303	25,000	0	11,427	11,427	11,427	11,427
Structural Repairs - PROW	97306	60,738	0	38,091	38,091	38,091	38,091
Carriageway resurfacing	97342	930,211	0	1,136,540	1,136,540	1,136,540	1,136,540
Road safety & trafficman programme	97352	200,088	0	129,508	129,508	129,508	129,508
LTF Active Travel Mapping 15-16	97356	5,000	0	0			
LTF A40/A466 Wyebridge Junction Imps 15-16	97357	260,000	0	0			
LTF Aber/Llanfoist Active Travel Network ph 1 15-16	97358	349,000	0	0			
LTF Abergavenny TC Public Realm	97367	350,000					
SRIC Wonatow Road Pedestrian Crossing	97368	38,000					
Highways OPS: Minor improvements	37369	150,000	0	0			
Raglan depot Sewage Upgrade	95058	50,000	0	0			

Shirehall= upgrade hearing loop	95059	6,500					
<b>Infrastructure &amp; Transport Schemes</b>		<b>3,643,443</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,240,740</b>	<b>2,240,740</b>	<b>2,240,740</b>	<b>2,240,740</b>
Replacement Cattle Market	90038	183,357	0	0			
Capital Region City Deal	90041	0	0	83,000	482,000	472,000	729,000
Section 106 schemes	Various	1,351,146	0	126,237			
<b>Regeneration Schemes</b>		<b>1,534,503</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>209,237</b>	<b>482,000</b>	<b>472,000</b>	<b>729,000</b>
County Farms Maintenance	98059	330,773	0	300,773	300,773	300,773	300,773
<b>County Farms Schemes</b>		<b>330,773</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300,773</b>	<b>300,773</b>	<b>300,773</b>	<b>300,773</b>
Disabled Facilities Grant	99202	900,000	0	900,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Access For All	91100	250,000	0	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
<b>Inclusion Schemes</b>		<b>1,150,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,150,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>
Agresso system upgrade	96620	9,888	0	0			
Revenues system - online facility functionality	96621	13,000	0	0			
Schools IT	96627	351,233	0	0			
<b>ICT Schemes</b>		<b>374,121</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Leasing - To be allocated		1,500,000	0	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
<b>Vehicles Leasing</b>		<b>1,500,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,500,000</b>	<b>1,500,000</b>	<b>1,500,000</b>	<b>1,500,000</b>
Car Parks General		450,000	0	0			
Car Park - Granville ST and Wyebridge St	98826	252,214	0	0			
Non County Farms Fixed Asset Disposal Costs	98060	318,334	0	0			
Area Management	97236	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
<b>Other Schemes</b>		<b>1,040,548</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>		<b>50,145,063</b>	<b>6,000,000</b>	<b>30,305,016</b>	<b>8,122,790</b>	<b>7,362,790</b>	<b>7,619,790</b>







## Appendix 4 – Forecast capital receipts 2017/18 to 2021/22

<b><u>GENERAL RECEIPTS</u></b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Balance as at 1st April	18,931	5,315	(393)	4,662	9,817
Less: capital receipts used for financing	(1,558)	(509)	(509)	(509)	(509)
Less: capital receipts used for financing Monmouth, Caldicot and Welsh medium 21c school provision	(15,077)	(11,663)	0	0	0
Capital receipts received to date	0	0	0	0	1
	2,296	(6,857)	(902)	4,153	9,309
Capital receipts forecast	2,855	6,300	5,400	5,500	
Deferred capital receipts – General	4	4	4	4	5
- Morrisons	160	160	160	160	160
Less: capital receipts set aside:	0	0	0	0	
<b>Balance as at 31st March</b>	<b>5,315</b>	<b>(393)</b>	<b>4,662</b>	<b>9,817</b>	<b>9,474</b>

## Appendix 5 – Capital receipts risk factors

The analysis below provides a summary of the receipts and the respective risk factors:

Risk Factor	2017/18 £	2018/19 £	2019/2020 £	2020/21 £	2021/22 £	
<b>Education Receipts</b>						
Low / completed	100,000	0	0	0	0	97%
Medium	0	0	0	0	0	3%
High	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	<u>100,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
<b>County Farm Receipts</b>						
Low / completed	0	0	0	0	0	46%
Medium	1,200,000	0	0	0	0	54%
High	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	<u>1,200,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
<b>General Receipts</b>						
Low / completed	170,000	160,000	160,000	160,000	0	98.6%
Medium	200,000	0	0	0	0	1.4%
High	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
	<u>370,000</u>	<u>160,000</u>	<u>160,000</u>	<u>160,000</u>	<u>0</u>	
<b>Strategic Accommodation Review</b>						
Low / completed	250,000	0	0	0	0	54.1%
Medium	0	0	0	0	0	45.9%
High	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	<u>250,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
<b>Dependent on Outcome of LDP</b>						
Low / completed	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	0	0	57%
Medium	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,400,000	0	0	43%
High	0	0	0	50,000	0	0%
	<u>5,400,000</u>	<u>5,400,000</u>	<u>5,500,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>0</u>	
<b>TOTALS</b>						
Low / completed	3,620,000	3,260,000	3,260,000	160,000	0	80%
Medium	3,700,000	2,300,000	2,400,000	0	0	20%
High	0	0	0	50,000	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>7,320,000</u></b>	<b><u>5,560,000</u></b>	<b><u>5,660,000</u></b>	<b><u>210,000</u></b>	<b><u>0</u></b>	

### Risk Factor key:

- High** - External factors affecting the potential sale that are out of Authority control  
**Medium** - Possible risk elements attached but within Authority ability to control  
**Low** - No major complications are foreseen for the transaction

## **Exempt Appendix 6 – Forecast receipts**

Detail Supplied Separately

### **SCHEDULE 12A LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972** **EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE OF DOCUMENTS**

**Meeting and Date of Meeting:** Special Cabinet 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017

**Report:** Capital MTFP Proposals 2018/19 to 2021/22 - Detailed Receipts Appendix

**Author:** Mark Howcroft

I have considered grounds for exemption of information contained in the background paper for the report referred to above and make the following recommendation to the Proper Officer:-

**Exemptions applying to the report:**

The appendix noted has an indication of land and assets that the Council proposes to sell and what the Council would be indicatively prepared to take for such.

**Factors in favour of disclosure:**

Openness & transparency in matters concerned with the public

**Prejudice which would result if the information were disclosed:**

To circulate such a document would prejudice negotiation over the levels of receipts and mitigate an opportunity to maximize returns.

**My view on the public interest test is as follows:**

Factors in favour of disclosure do not outweigh those against.

**Recommended decision on exemption from disclosure:**

Maintain exemption from publication in relation to report

Date: 3/11/17

Signed: M. Howcroft

Post: Assistant Head of Finance

---

I accept/I do not accept the recommendation made above

Signed: [Signed by Chief Officer / Head of Service / Chief Executive]

Date: 3/11/17

Appendix 7 – Future Generations Evaluation



monmouthshire  
sir fynwy

**Future Generations Evaluation**  
( includes Equalities and Sustainability Impact Assessments)



<p><b>Name of the Officer</b> completing the evaluation Mark Howcroft</p> <p><b>Phone no:</b>01633 644740 <b>E-mail:</b>markhowcroft@monmouthshire.gov.uk</p>	<p><b>Please give a brief description of the aims of the proposal</b> <b>Present capital budget proposals for consultation</b></p>
<p><b>Name of Service</b> Whole authority</p>	<p><b>Date Future Generations Evaluation</b> form completed 03/11/17</p>




**1. Does your proposal deliver any of the well-being goals below?** Please explain the impact (positive and negative) you expect, together with suggestions of how to mitigate negative impacts or better contribute to the goal.

<b>Well Being Goal</b>	<b>How does the proposal contribute to this goal? (positive and negative)</b>	<b>What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?</b>
<p><b>A prosperous Wales</b> Efficient use of resources, skilled, educated people, generates wealth, provides jobs</p>	<p>Local resources will be engaged to deliver the projects in the programme</p>	
<p><b>A resilient Wales</b> Maintain and enhance biodiversity and ecosystems that support resilience and can adapt to change (e.g. climate change)</p>		
<p><b>A healthier Wales</b> People’s physical and mental wellbeing is maximized and health impacts are understood</p>		

Well Being Goal	How does the proposal contribute to this goal? (positive and negative)	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<b>A Wales of cohesive communities</b> Communities are attractive, viable, safe and well connected	Investment in Future schools provides a key community facility to help promote this goal	
<b>A globally responsible Wales</b> Taking account of impact on global well-being when considering local social, economic and environmental wellbeing		
<b>A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language</b> Culture, heritage and Welsh language are promoted and protected. People are encouraged to do sport, art and recreation		
<b>A more equal Wales</b> People can fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances	The budgets for DDA work and DFGs have been maintained at existing levels.	

**2. How has your proposal embedded and prioritised the sustainable governance principles in its development?**

Sustainable Development Principle	How does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle?	What has been done to better to meet this principle?
 <p>Long-term Balancing short term need with long term and planning for the future</p>	Building Future schools will benefit children and communities for future generations	
 <p>Collaboration Working together with other partners to deliver objectives</p>		

Sustainable Development Principle	How does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle?	What has been done to better to meet this principle?
 <p data-bbox="159 292 315 323">Involvement</p> <p data-bbox="331 156 521 336">Involving those with an interest and seeking their views</p>	<p data-bbox="551 156 1328 225">The aim of the report is to present proposals for consultation with key stakeholders</p>	
 <p data-bbox="159 477 315 509">Prevention</p> <p data-bbox="331 341 521 560">Putting resources into preventing problems occurring or getting worse</p>		
 <p data-bbox="159 700 315 732">Integration</p> <p data-bbox="331 564 521 817">Positively impacting on people, economy and environment and trying to benefit all three</p>	<p data-bbox="551 564 1328 633">Investment in Future Schools will positively impact on the teaching environment</p>	

**3. Are your proposals going to affect any people or groups of people with protected characteristics?** Please explain the impact, the evidence you have used and any action you are taking below.

<b>Protected Characteristics</b>	<b>Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic</b>	<b>Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic</b>	<b>What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?</b>
Age			
Disability	DDA and DFG budgets have been maintained		
Gender reassignment			
Marriage or civil partnership			
Race			
Religion or Belief			
Sex			
Sexual Orientation			
Welsh Language			



4. Council has agreed the need to consider the impact its decisions has on important responsibilities of Corporate Parenting and safeguarding. Are your proposals going to affect either of these responsibilities? For more information please see the guidance <http://hub/corporatedocs/Democratic%20Services/Safeguarding%20Guidance.docx> and for more on Monmouthshire's Corporate Parenting Strategy see <http://hub/corporatedocs/SitePages/Corporate%20Parenting%20Strategy.aspx>

	<b>Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on safeguarding and corporate parenting</b>	<b>Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on safeguarding and corporate parenting</b>	<b>What will you do/ have you done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?</b>
Safeguarding	Safeguarding is taken into account in the design of the new schools		
Corporate Parenting			

5. What evidence and data has informed the development of your proposal?

Previously determined policy in respect of the priority of investing in future schools. There have been no major changes to the proposals presented here.

**6. SUMMARY: As a result of completing this form, what are the main positive and negative impacts of your proposal, how have they informed/changed the development of the proposal so far and what will you be doing in future?**

Capital budgets which impact on individuals, such as DFGs and DDA works are being maintained at existing levels.  
The investment in future schools is expected to have a benefit for children and communities for future generations

**7. Actions. As a result of completing this form are there any further actions you will be undertaking? Please detail them below, if applicable.**

<b>What are you going to do</b>	<b>When are you going to do it?</b>	<b>Who is responsible</b>	<b>Progress</b>

**8. Monitoring: The impacts of this proposal will need to be monitored and reviewed. Please specify the date at which you will evaluate the impact, and where you will report the results of the review.**

<b>The impacts of this proposal will be evaluated on:</b>	<b>Annually when the capital MTFP is reviewed</b>
---	---