COMMITTEE & BID NUMBER

Environment & Safe Communities Committee Bid 5

PROJECT TITLE

Upper Mill pond and Horse pond repairs.

ACCOUNATBLE OFFICER

Officer responsible for project
planning and delivery of the
scheme. Accountable officers are
also responsible for post project
review

Tony Foxwell, Mark Shephard, Stewart Cocker, Ian Dyer

in maintaining the globally rare chalk stream eco system of the

DETAILS OF PROJECT The following works are proposed in two sections to prevent any further water escape or loss. Leaks in the banks of the Upper Mill Pond require large scale repair. Leak to the Horse pond weir, requires removal of existing weir and construction of new weir. Adjustable water outlet/weir to area between front channel and Horse pond required to regulate water levels. Reports attached which recommend proposed works and provide some costings. Due to the nature of these works and the unforeseen element, allow a larger contingency of 30% Upper Mill Pond works as described in report but in brief include sampling of silt for contaminants, ground penetrating radar survey. flood risk plan, environmental impact assessment, provision of heavy plant, welfare facilities, ground protection, diverting water, pumps, Project scope, what is trackway fish rescue, silt removal as required for carrying out these included/excluded in the scheme works(but to clarify not for the whole pond). Removal of nicospan system, installation of puddle clay to prevent any further leaks to banks. For the sum of £160,000 Horse Pond works Include sampling of silt for contaminants, ground penetrating radar survey, flood risk plan, provision of heavy plant, welfare facilities, environmental Impact Assessment, ground protection, diverting water, pumps, trackway fish rescue, silt removal as required for carrying out these works(but to clarify not for the whole pond). Removal of existing defective leaking weir structure and reconstruction, provision of new brickwork baffle wall to area near road waterway channel which includes a non return HDPE flap value. For the sum of £65,000 Contingency £67,500 The works when completed will have repaired the Horse Pond cracked weir and leaking bank of the Upper Mill Pond, to help Project outcomes and benefits

Hogsmill River.

In addition this will help public perception as there have been many CRM cases about these issues over the years and much Councillor interest.

Full bid to answer whether Southeast Rivers are involved in the area; The South east Rivers Trust are aware of the problem and have assisted in investigating the leaks in early 2019 and via the Hogsmill Catchment Partnership they continue to lobby partners to do everything in their power to protect and enhance the Hogsmill River

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

		Cost of Project	Comments and detail where necessary. Provide appendices where relevant. Examples of business cases spreadsheets can be found in the Finance Handbook
а	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	292k	
b	Consultancy or other fees	9k	Already funded from Planned maintenance budget
С	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	301	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	
е	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	301	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)		
g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Bid (e-f)	292	
h	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Savings as a Direct Result of the Project	0	
i	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Costs as a Direct Result of the Project	0	

Year	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
	£	£	£
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	292,000		

REVENUE IMPACT

Can revenue implications be funded from the Committee Base Budget? – Please give details	N/A
--	-----

CORPORATE PLAN 2016/20

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key	Yes Keeping clean and green	
Priorities? If so, say which ones and evidence how.		
How does project fit within service objectives?		

TIMESCALES

What is the proposed timetable for completion of the project? Give estimated start and finish dates for each stage of the project. These dates will be used as milestones during quarterly budget monitoring to assess performance of project delivery.

		Target Start Date	Target Finish Date
1	Design & Planning	April/May 2020	
2	Further Approvals Needed		
3	Tendering (if necessary)	June/July 2020	
4	Project start date	Aug/Sept 2020	
5	Project Finish Date	October 2020	

All capital schemes are assessed against criteria set by the Capital Member Group annually. Bids should meet at least one of these criteria. State which capital criteria(s) for assessing bids are met and why. <u>Leave blank any which are not met</u>.

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria;

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (7 years for renewable energy projects).
- The return required on capital employed should be linked to the potential cost of borrowing (MRP) rather than potential loss of investment income.
- Risk of not achieving return on investment is low.
- Clear definition of financial cost/benefits of the scheme.

Members may consider schemes with longer paybacks on major spend to save projects going forward, especially those that incur borrowing.

Is there a guarantee of the scheme being fully externally funded and is it classed as a high priority? Please give details of funding streams, including any restrictions on the funding.	
Is the Scheme a Spend to Save Project? Will investment improve service efficiency including cost savings or income generation? What is the payback in years?	No
It is mandatory for the Council to provide the scheme? Is investment required to meet Health and Safety or other legislative requirements? If so, state which requirements.	Currently being assessed by EEBC legal department.
Is this project the minimum scheme required to continue to deliver the services of the Council? - Is investment required for the business continuity of the Council? If so, say how.	No

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Ξ.		
	Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?	No

PRIORITISATION

State which **one** of the four prioritisation categories are met and why.

1	Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.	
2	Investment Important to achieve Key Priorities.	Keeping the borough clean and green
3	Investment important to secure service continuity and improvement.	
4	Investment will assist but is not required to meet one of the baseline criteria.	

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHEME

	IONO AGGOGIATED WITH GOTIEME		
1	Outline the risks of delivering this project to timetable and budget. (Please do not include risks to the service or asset if project is not approved.)	Main risk will be weather this could delay or extend works.	
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	no	
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	Continued leaks issues with locals and environment agency.	
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	Leave the banks leaking, they may continue to get worse and cause major flooding.	

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of who with and when by.	Yes with local community, environment agency and water authorities.
---	---

Ward(s) affected by the scheme	Ewell ward
--------------------------------	------------

Accountable Officer Responsible for Delivery of the Scheme

Name and Signature Tony Foxwell Date 23/09/2019

Whole life revenue costs of capital project

Where savings or budget virements are being used to part fund a project, the relevant budget manager must sign the appraisal form.

Accountable Officers for the revenue implications of the project

Project Manager Name and Signature	Date
Revenue Budget Holder Name and Signature	Date
Service Accountant Name and Signature	Date