

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

COMMITTEE & PROPOSAL NUMBER

Environment 1

PROJECT TITLE

Stew Ponds removal of silt

ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

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

Justin Turvey / Tony Foxwell

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme	To carry out various ecological and environmental surveys, prepare scheme to remove silt from Stew Pond by creating a island in the middle of the pond with the removed silt.
Project outcomes and benefits	<p>Benefits & opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- improved habitat for fish and wildlife by restoring the central island, variation in depth and reeded margins and by careful management of trees.- Give better access to refurbished angling swims, particularly for disabled anglers.- Enhance visual character of the pond- Involve local groups to take ownership of the pond and improve biodiversity- Use materials such as wooden faggots & stakes that can be sourced locally <p>Background Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-De-silting last took place in 1988-The pond has been leased to a fishing club (central Association of London and Provincial Angling Clubs CALPAC) since 1988.-The reason for allowing fishing on the Stew Pond is to protect the nearby Great Pond (restored in 1979) where no fishing is allowed.-De-silting is identified by 2016-2116 management plan and is therefore Council policy.-There is recognition going back to 2010 that to retain the pond as a fishing pond removing silt is necessary and the creation of a central island will be a significant habitat improvement for wildlife in a nationally and internationally important site for wildlife.-The pond is surrounded by woodland and the inevitable leaf fall causes the pond to silt up relatively rapidly.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

-De-silting and increasing the depth of the pond will provide greater resilience against climate/temperature change where warmer temperatures have already caused issues for the level of dissolved oxygen, requiring pumps to oxygenate the water and protect the fish stock in recent years.

-In 2010 plans were drawn up to de-silt the pond with an estimated cost of approx. 100K. Increasing costs indicate a proposal in the region of 150k

-Proceeding with this project will require a survey of the silt to ascertain if any contamination exists and to estimate the quantity of silt. An assent will be required from Natural England as the pond lies within a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Previously the Environment Agency were supportive of the project paying for the silt survey and should be engaged again. EEBC paid for a bat survey which would need to be repeated.

The need for this project goes back over many years and an eye has always been kept out for any external funding opportunities. Unfortunately, none has materialised and it is very difficult for local authorities to source the level of funding required from grants. For example, a lottery bid via the fishing club was considered in 2010 but the fact that it was local authority owned disqualified the bid. We have done extremely well over the last couple of decades at sourcing considerable outside funding for the management of Epsom Common, including path restoration and habitat/wildlife management so in that context a capital proposal does not seem unreasonable, as it is Council policy via the management plan to desilt the pond as part of our overall responsibility for managing and enhancing the site, for which we have a statutory duty under CROW. Another option would be to consider a green infrastructure bid under the larger CIL pot?

Specialist services

These works will require consultants' services and therefore additional fee costs for professional services have been allowed for.

Questions

1/ Final proposal must consider whether partial de-silting could be undertaken and the costs of the option.

The preferred design involves creating an Island in the middle of the pond using dredged silt, so by default the proposal is a part de-silting.

2/ The detailed proposal should also cover the implications or not of undertaking the work and whether there is an impact on the climate change action plan.

Please note the reason for having controlled fishing on the Stew Pond is to protect the wildlife of the nearby and larger

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

	Great Pond. If the Stew Pond is not de-silted the existing fish stock remain at risk from higher water temperatures caused by climate change. In turn that could lead to the fishing club relinquishing their lease and consequently with no bailiff the wildlife found on great pond would be at risk from uncontrolled fishing.
--	---

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
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	130k	
b	Consultancy or other fees	20k	
c	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	150k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0k	
e	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	150k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Proposal (e-f)	150k	
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	

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Year	2025/26 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	150k spend in 2025

REVENUE IMPACT

Can Revenue Implications be funded from the Committee Base Budget? – Please give details	No revenue implications
--	-------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Does the scheme meet any of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan targets, and if so, which ones?	The climate change action plan includes targets to reflect our commitment to tackling climate change in the biodiversity action plan and to secure National Nature Reserve status on Epsom Common LNR. The Management Plan for Epsom Common LNR 2016-2116 includes the action to de-silt Stew Pond.
--	---

STRATEGIC PLAN

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Themes? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	Enhance the boroughs natural assets, preserving and increasing biodiversity.
---	--

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	January 2025	TBA
2	Further Approvals Needed	N/A	TBA
3	Tendering (if necessary)	March 2025	TBA
4	Project start date	July 2025	TBA
5	Project Finish Date	September 2025	TBA

BASELINE CRITERIA

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

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria:

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (10 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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is it 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.</p>	<p>We have biodiversity duty under the natural environment and rural committees Act 2006</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

<p>Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?</p>	<p>yes Green and Vibrant - a better place to live where people enjoy their surroundings</p>
---	---

PRIORITISATION

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

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

1	Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.	We have biodiversity duty under the natural environment and rural committees Act 2006
2	Investment Important to achieve Key Priorities.	
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

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.)	Risk associated with this project are access to the ponds is restricted and weather conditions will have an impact on carrying out the works.
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	There is a risk of danger to fish through contaminates in the water.
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	None

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of the who with and when by.	Yes with the local community
--	------------------------------

Ward(s) affected by the scheme	Stamford Green ward
---------------------------------------	---------------------

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

**COMMITTEE &
PROPOSAL
NUMBER**

Environment 2

PROJECT TITLE

Uppermill pond bank replacement - Phase 2

ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

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

Ian Dyer/Tony Foxwell

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme

Criteria

- Where the scheme is consistent with the Council's Climate Change Action Plan, subject to affordability, supported by a robust business case and value for money can be demonstrated through a maximum payback period of 10 years
- Minimum required to continue to deliver the services of Council (e.g., Minimum level of building maintenance and IT).

Scope of Works

The previous first phase works were very successful however the section of wall from the Main water pipe down to the Samaritans has also started leaking and causing excessive water loss. We have a statutory obligation to repair this to prevent water loss. The proposal is to remove dead and dangerous trees close to the wall and provide and install new sheet piling to create new river bank wall.

Upper mill pond works include ground penetrating radar survey, flood risk plan, provision of heavy plant, welfare facilities, ground protection, diverting water, pumps, sheet piling and removal of trees and foliage.

Project outcomes and benefits

Benefits and opportunities

The works when completed will reduce leakage from riverbanks, help in repairing the river eco system, ensure we comply with the Hogs mill catchment partnership agreement and satisfy our biodiversity duty under the natural environment and rural committees Act 2006 as a public body.

Questions

Clarification sought as to whether the water pipe falls under the Council's remit or is the local waterboard responsible? The waterpipe is mentioned only as an indicator from where the second phase works start. There are no works to the waterpipe as this is the waterboards responsibility.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

	<p>Request for extra information What is the impact of the water loss? If works were deferred, would this lead to building damage/subsidence/environmental hazard to wildlife?</p> <p>The impact of the water loss is seen further down the hogs mill and is causing danger to local wildlife conditions. If banks were to break, then severe flooding would occur to the area by the Samaritans</p>
--	--

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
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	150k	
b	Consultancy or other fees	0	
c	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	150k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	
e	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	150k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Proposal (e-f)	150k	
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	

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Year	2025/26 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	All £150k spend in 2025

REVENUE IMPACT

Can Revenue Implications be funded from the Committee Base Budget? – Please give details	No impact
--	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Does the scheme meet any of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan targets, and if so, which ones?	Yes to be Green and Vibrant - a better place to live where people enjoy their surroundings
--	--

STRATEGIC PLAN

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Themes? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	Enhance the boroughs natural assets, preserving and increasing biodiversity.
---	--

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	Jan 2025	TBA
2	Further Approvals Needed	N/A	TBA
3	Tendering (if necessary)	Feb 2025	TBA
4	Project start date	July 2025	TBA
5	Project Finish Date	Sept 2025	TBA

BASELINE CRITERIA

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

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria:

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (10 years for renewable energy projects).

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

- 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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is it 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.</p>	<p>When the last leaks occurred previously, we received a Letter to Chief Executive from Environment agency stating low flows in Hog mill river. Requesting permanent solution to prevent leakage. We have biodiversity duty under the natural environment and rural committees Act 2006 as a public body and work closely with Hogs mill catchment partnership.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No</p>

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

<p>Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?</p>	
---	--

PRIORITISATION

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

<p>1</p>	<p>Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.</p>	<p>Yes, we have biodiversity duty under the natural environment and rural committees Act 2006 as a public body and work closely with Hogsmill catchment partnership.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Investment Important to achieve Key Priorities.</p>	

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

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

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.)	Weather is a risk for delivering project, the works are best carried out when water levels are low, and this depends on the amount of rain we have, and the ponds are fed from natural springs which run up to 6 months after heavy periods of rain.
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	No
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	If works were deferred, would this lead to building damage/subsidence/environmental hazard to wildlife? The impact of the water loss is seen further down the hogs mill and is causing danger to local wildlife conditions. If banks were to break, then severe flooding would occur to the area by the Samaritans
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	Temporary measures have already been carried out.

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of the who with and when by.	Yes, we need to consult with the environment agency
--	---

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

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

COMMITTEE & PROPOSAL NUMBER

Environment 3

PROJECT TITLE

Ashley Centre multi-storey car park - overcoating waterproof membrane

ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

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

Rod Brown/Richard Chevalier/Tony Foxwell

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme

Criteria

Where it is mandatory for the Council to provide the scheme (e.g., Disabled Facilities Grants and Health and Safety). Minimum required to continue to deliver the services of Council (e.g., Minimum level of building maintenance and IT).

Scope of Works

To levels 1-3 of multistorey car park - Apply new waterproof membrane as existing coating is wearing off the guaranteed expired a couple of years ago the entrance area is looking shabby where the deck shield no longer provides waterproof protection to the floor. The works will involve shutting areas of car park in order to carry out the works, some nighttime working will be required for entrance and exit level one due to the extensive traffic through the normal working day. The areas must be scabbled off, cleaned and prepare, any deviations and spalling in existing surface will have to be made good prior to application of new deck shield product. This is applied in a 3-coat system and new line markings are applied.

Cost estimate (provided by specialist contractor)

Level 1: Deckshield Rapide ID (4,412m²)

- Costs based on 4 x phases of works consisting of night shifts
- £41.68m² = £183,892.16

Level 2: Deckshield ID with Rapide Topcoat (4,862m²)

- Costs based on 2 x phases of work consisting of normal working hours
- £22.31m² = £104,455.42

Level 3: Deckshield ID with Rapide Topcoat (7,145m²)

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Costs based on 3 x phases of work consisting of normal working hours- £22.31m² = £159,404.95 <p>Total £448k, allow £10k for concrete repairs across all 3 levels Line making for all 3 levels £22k</p> <p>Total cost for works 480k</p> <p>Consultant's costs to manage project at 12% £57.6k</p> <p>All costs £537.6k</p>
Project outcomes and benefits	<p>Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Where it is mandatory for the Council to provide the scheme (e.g., Disabled Facilities Grants and Health and Safety).- Minimum required to continue to deliver the services of Council (e.g., Minimum level of building maintenance and IT). <p>Benefits</p> <p>The works will prevent leaks down into to shopping centre, protects the concrete from carbonisation and looks aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>Could the urgency of these works be clarified?</p> <p>The detailed proposal must include further detail on the risk of deferring the works. Also, to be included is a breakdown of the current state of and individual cost for each level, and whether just 1, 2 or all 3 levels could be undertaken Clarification as to which level would leak into the shopping centre also to be detailed, as well as how much have relevant material prices increased over the last three years.</p> <p>If works are not carried out -This will allow moisture to penetrate the concrete and oxidise the reinforcement causing spalling concrete and trip hazards. Where the waterproofing membrane covers the concrete, it provides extra protection. EEBC has a duty of care to protect the shopping centre below from leaks. This system provides waterproofing to those areas. It is not known whether deferring these works will cause immediate damage into the shopping centre or create more concrete repairs, but prevention tends to be cheaper than leaving works until failures occur.</p> <p>The current condition of all three levels is poor. The water ingress to car park travels around all levels and through the columns to the shops. Total waterproofing needs</p>

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

	<p>to cover all floors and this gives protection from salts damaging the concrete and oxidisation of the reinforcement causing spalling and trip hazards. The increase in costs over the last three years is approximately 25%.</p> <p>If works are carried out all together there is only one set of site preliminary costs. If the works are carried out separately, there will be a set of preliminary costs for each floor, at an estimated £10k per floor.</p> <p>Additional income generated for the car park from the Playhouse shows is not easily quantifiable as there are no records kept as to whether Playhouse attendees are using the car park on performance nights. For the month of May 2024, on average, car park income on performance nights increased by £486. This was calculated based on income after 8pm on performance nights compared to non performance nights income covering 17 shows nights. However, this figure is subjective as it could also be generated by users of Epsom nightlife eg. Club/pub visitors in Epsom Town centre.</p>
--	---

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
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	480k	
b	Consultancy or other fees	57.6k	Consultant project management cost
c	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	537.6k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	
e	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	537.6k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Proposal (e-f)	537.6k	
h	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Savings as a Direct Result of the Project		
i	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Costs as a Direct Result of the Project		

Year	2025/26 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	£537.6k spend in Sept/October 2025

REVENUE IMPACT

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Does the scheme meet any of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan targets, and if so, which ones?	No
--	----

STRATEGIC PLAN

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Themes? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	Arts and culture as the Ashley Centre car park is used for Parking when visiting the theatre.
---	---

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.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

		Target Start Date	Target Finish Date
1	Design & Planning	March 2025	TBA
2	Further Approvals Needed	N/A	TBA
3	Tendering (if necessary)	May 2025	TBA
4	Project start date	September 025	TBA
5	Project Finish Date	November 2025	TBA

BASELINE CRITERIA

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

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria:

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (10 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.

<p>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.</p>	No
<p>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?</p>	No
<p>Is it 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.</p>	Yes work will improve surface of car park preventing slips and trips and deviations in the concrete. Gives advance protection from oxidisation of reinforcement bars in concrete.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

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.	
---	--

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?	Yes
--	-----

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.	
3	Investment important to secure service continuity and improvement.	Yes the existing surface is worn and no longer provides adequate waterproofing, this could lead to water leaks in the shopping centre and we have repairs obligations within the lease.
4	Investment will assist but is not required to meet one of the baseline criteria.	

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHEME

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.)	Works may have to be planned and phase out of hours with areas blocked off and traffic management to prevent injuries. This may increase length of time to complete works and be disruptive to the normal operation of the car park.
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	No have allowed for consultancy fees to deliver the project
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	Water can leak into shopping centre and the concrete will deteriorate with salts being brought in on the vehicle's tires.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	None
---	--	------

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of the who with and when by.	Yes consultation with the shopping centre is essential to ensure smooth working relationship.
--	---

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

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

**COMMITTEE &
PROPOSAL
NUMBER**

Environment 4

PROJECT TITLE

Court Recreation Ground renewal of 3G football pitch

ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

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

Ian Dyer/Sam Whitehead/Tony Foxwell

DETAILS OF PROJECT

<p>Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme</p>	<p>Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Where the scheme is consistent with the Council's Climate Change Action Plan, subject to affordability, supported by a robust business case and value for money can be demonstrated through a maximum payback period of 10 years- Minimum required to continue to deliver the services of Council (e.g., Minimum level of building maintenance and IT). <p>Scope of Works</p> <p>Using specialist machinery, extract infill for disposal and remove and recycle existing artificial grass surface. 10m x 10m of repairs to the existing macadam using hot laid AC 10 porous Macadam. Supply and install Tiger Turf 3rd generation football turf with sand-rubber infill; Polytan Monofilament with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elite 40mm professional AT system - FIFA Quality Pro on 25mm insitu.
<p>Project outcomes and benefits</p>	<p>Benefits</p> <p>The new improved surface will potentially allow for increased fees and last a further 10 years and can be marketed as a new surface. It will prevent serious injuries in use. Last year the fencing was upgraded and renewed, these works will continue to enhance the facilities.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>Could urgency of these works be clarified? Last year we had some repair works carried out to the pitch where it was damaged, and the specialist company gave us advise that the system had done well over the past 12 years, but they recommended renewal of the covering.</p> <p>What would be the impact if works were deferred? The pitch is at end of life we have concerns that users may be injured due to age of surface and possible insurance claims may be submitted. If closed due to poor surface, there would be a significant loss of income.</p>

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

	<p>Does the surface renewal need to be FIFA quality, or could cheaper materials be used? The 3G surface is standard in all these types of installation.</p> <p>Would FIFA quality surface attract a higher usage or justify a higher fee payable by clubs? Potentially yes it will increase usage as not many 3G pitches in the county.</p> <p>Could Property department confirm this to be an enhancement to the existing surface? If so, could CIL funding be considered if these works meet development funding criteria. A CIL bid was not previously considered in this case, can be considered if timeframes extended as this is fairly urgent to replace to prevent injuries and claims.</p> <p>Can pitch fees be increased to meet income targets for investment following spend to save criteria? With increased marketing the pitch can be maximise for income.</p> <p>Extra information required. The detailed proposal must include current income levels and whether it could be positioned as a spend to save scheme by increasing fees/charges and/or the number of bookings. Information to be included regarding other 3G pitches in the area and any new ones in the pipeline to understand how this might impact future revenue streams. Health and Wellbeing benefits and Health & Safety concerns to be expanded upon in the detailed proposal.</p> <p>This information is provided via Tim Weston's link in attached email.</p>
--	---

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
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	130k	
b	Consultancy or other fees	0	
c	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	130k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

e	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	130k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Proposal (e-f)	130k	
h	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Savings as a Direct Result of the Project	3k	Had to repair damaged sections of 3G pitch last year, more repairs would be required if pitch is not renewed.
i	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Costs as a Direct Result of the Project	0	

Year	2025/26 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	£130k in 2025

REVENUE IMPACT

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Does the scheme meet any of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan targets, and if so, which ones?	No
--	----

STRATEGIC PLAN

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Themes? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	No
---	----

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.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

		Target Start Date	Target Finish Date
1	Design & Planning	November 2024	TBA
2	Further Approvals Needed	N/A	TBA
3	Tendering (if necessary)	January 2025	TBA
4	Project start date	July 2025	TBA
5	Project Finish Date	August 2025	TBA

BASELINE CRITERIA

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

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria:

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (10 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.

<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p>	
<p>Is it 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.</p>	<p>Yes this football pitch has reached the end of its life and is getting more dangerous to play on.</p>

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

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.	
---	--

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?	Yes
--	-----

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.	
3	Investment important to secure service continuity and improvement.	Yes if the football pitch is not replaced soon, it will not be safe enough to hire out and this will affect revenue and service.
4	Investment will assist but is not required to meet one of the baseline criteria.	

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHEME

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.)	Need to plan date for works in advance with the support services to block out bookings to enable works to take place.
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	No
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	If the football pitch is not replaced soon, it will not be safe enough to hire out and this will affect revenue and service.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	None
---	---	------

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of the who with and when by.	Yes with support services and hirers to block out time to carry out the works
--	---

Ward(s) affected by the scheme	Town Ward
---------------------------------------	-----------

Additional Information

Court Rec astro turf Information to support Capital proposal

Current income levels

The most accurate financial figure for 2024 is £21,000. It appears there were some coding errors in the data from previous years.

Bench marking

	5-a-side			7 a side		
	Off Peak	Peak	Average	Off Peak	Peak	Average
Goals	£74	£104	£89	£107	£107	£107
Power league	£80	£95	£88	£90	£115	£103
Excel centre Walton on Thames	£59	£59	£59	£67.5	£109	£88
Epsom and Ewell High School				£70		£35
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council				£28.5	£55	£42
Guildford borough council	£11	£50	£31			

Analysis of Epsom and Ewell's Offerings

Epsom currently charges for 9-a-side pitches but does not offer 5-a-side or 7-a-side options, which presents an opportunity for increased revenue. By expanding to these formats, Epsom could attract a wider range of players, including casual teams and leagues seeking more flexible play options.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Additionally, the existing pitches do not conform to official FA sizing standards, limiting their use primarily to training rather than competitive matches. However, by becoming FA-sized, Epsom's pitch could accommodate local clubs for matches, significantly increasing their usage. This would be particularly beneficial when neighbouring grass pitches are affected by weather conditions, providing teams with a reliable alternative for hosting games.

Offering FA-compliant pitches would not only enhance Epsom's reputation but also make it a more appealing option for local clubs seeking suitable venues for competitive play. This shift could lead to greater community engagement and potentially higher revenue through match fees and increased bookings, aligning Epsom more closely with successful models like Goals and Powerleague, which primarily cater to the 5-a-side market.

Health and Wellbeing benefits

5G AstroTurf facilities, especially those meeting FA (Football Association) standards, offer numerous health and wellbeing benefits for players and communities. Here's an overview:

1. Improved Physical Health

Increased Physical Activity: The availability of high-quality 5G AstroTurf facilities encourages more frequent and longer playtime for athletes and casual players. This can lead to improved cardiovascular health, enhanced stamina, muscle development, and better overall fitness.

All-Weather Play: These surfaces are designed to withstand various weather conditions, allowing year-round use. This consistency ensures that physical activity is not disrupted by rain or poor weather, which is common on natural grass fields.

Reduced Injuries: 5G surfaces are designed to provide better shock absorption and stability, reducing the risk of common sports injuries such as twisted ankles, knee injuries, and muscle strains. Proper maintenance and FA compliance further enhance safety standards.

2. Mental Wellbeing

Stress Reduction: Regular physical activity has been proven to reduce stress levels and improve mental health. The opportunity to participate in football or other sports on high-quality surfaces promotes relaxation and endorphin release.

Community Building and Social Interaction: The accessibility of these facilities creates a space for social engagement, teamwork, and camaraderie. Players, coaches, and community members can benefit from positive social experiences, which can boost morale and foster a sense of belonging.

Mental Focus and Discipline: Regular involvement in sports helps develop mental focus, resilience, and discipline, which are essential for overall wellbeing. Playing on high-standard 5G pitches also enhances confidence as players can rely on the consistency and quality of the surface.

3. Accessibility and Inclusivity

Encourages Participation: High-quality 5G AstroTurf facilities that meet FA standards can accommodate a range of abilities, from grassroots to professional-level players. They also support inclusive participation, allowing both men and women, people with disabilities, and youth teams to access quality playing surfaces.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Youth Development: These facilities are particularly beneficial for youth, encouraging physical activity from a young age and helping develop essential motor skills, balance, and coordination. It also introduces children to teamwork, goal setting, and sportsmanship.

4. Environmental and Practical Benefits

Low Maintenance & Sustainability: 5G AstroTurf requires less water and fewer chemical treatments (like pesticides or fertilizers) than natural grass, making it a more sustainable option. The reduced need for maintenance allows these facilities to be open more often, offering more consistent access for local communities.

Improved Playability: Unlike natural grass, which can become muddy and uneven, especially in adverse weather, 5G AstroTurf remains smooth and consistent. This consistency allows for a faster, safer game, improving the quality of play and reducing frustration for players.

5. Support for FA and Football Development Goals

FA Compliance: When built to FA standards, 5G AstroTurf facilities provide high-quality, regulated environments for training and matches. They support FA's goals of increasing participation, improving skills development, and fostering grassroots football across communities.

Increased Usage by Clubs: Many grassroots and semi-professional clubs can benefit from 5G facilities as they provide a reliable training environment, helping develop local talent and promote healthy competition.

In summary, 5G AstroTurf facilities built to FA standards support both physical and mental wellbeing through safe, reliable, and inclusive spaces for sports participation, fostering both personal health and community development.

Health & Safety concerns

When an AstroTurf pitch lacks a shock absorber layer or when the turf is nearing the end of its life, several health and safety concerns can arise. These factors are critical for player safety, especially when the surface is used regularly for football and other sports. Here's a breakdown of the key issues:

1. Increased Risk of Injuries

Harder Surface Without Shock Absorption: A shock absorber layer (also known as an underlay or shock pad) is designed to reduce the impact on players' joints and muscles by providing cushioning during falls or when running. Without this layer, the surface becomes harder, leading to increased force upon impact. This can contribute to:

Joint Stress and Overuse Injuries: Players may experience greater strain on their knees, ankles, hips, and lower back due to the reduced shock absorption. This can lead to overuse injuries like tendinitis, shin splints, and stress fractures.

Higher Impact from Falls: Players are at a higher risk of more severe injuries from falls, including bruises, fractures, or concussions. The lack of cushioning increases the force of falls, particularly during high-speed collisions or tackles.

Foot and Ankle Injuries: The hardness of the turf increases the chances of sprains or fractures when players change direction suddenly or stop abruptly.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

2. Decreased Surface Performance (End of Life Turf)

Compacted and Flattened Fibers: As turf ages, the fibres become flattened, matted, or compacted, reducing their ability to provide the traction and softness needed for safe play. This can result in:

Slips and Falls: Reduced traction increases the likelihood of slipping, leading to trips, sprains, and other accidental injuries.

Irregular Surface: Over time, worn turf can develop uneven patches, holes, or divots, posing a tripping hazard to players.

Harder Surface Over Time: As the infill (rubber granules or sand) wears down or disperses over time, the surface becomes harder and less forgiving. Combined with the absence of a shock pad, this further elevates the risk of impact injuries.

Water Drainage Issues: End-of-life turf may experience poor drainage, causing puddles or slippery areas that can be dangerous for players.

3. Increased Risk of Concussion

Harder Impact During Falls: Without a shock pad, the AstroTurf surface is much less forgiving when players fall, particularly during collisions or tackles. The higher impact forces increase the likelihood of head injuries, including concussions, especially in contact sports like football or rugby.

4. Heat Retention

Turf Temperature: AstroTurf tends to retain heat, especially in warmer months. If the pitch is nearing the end of its life, the fibres and infill materials may degrade further, making the surface even hotter. Elevated temperatures can lead to:

Heat-related Stress or Illness: Players are at a greater risk of dehydration, heatstroke, and general heat-related stress.

Burn Injuries: Prolonged skin contact with extremely hot turf can cause turf burns, particularly if the surface is degraded and retains heat unevenly.

5. Increased Maintenance Risks

Deterioration of Infill Materials: As the pitch nears the end of its life, the rubber crumb or sand infill may become displaced, compacted, or degraded. This can result in a surface that is more abrasive, increasing the likelihood of skin burns or abrasions when players slide or fall on the turf.

Loose Debris: Old or degraded turf can begin to shed fibres, creating loose debris on the surface. This debris can increase the risk of cuts or infections, especially in cases where players have open wounds or turf burns.

6. Environmental and Health Concerns

Microplastic Shedding: As the AstroTurf ages, the breakdown of plastic fibres can lead to microplastic particles being released. These can be ingested by players or inhaled, especially in dusty conditions, raising potential long-term health concerns, although more research is needed in this area.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Increased Chemical Exposure: Older synthetic turf can leach chemicals from degraded materials, which may pose health risks from prolonged exposure. The breakdown of rubber infill may release volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which could be harmful, particularly to young children playing on the surface.

7. Mitigation Measures

Shock Pad Installation: If the turf lacks a shock absorber layer, retrofitting a shock pad underneath can significantly improve player safety, reducing impact-related injuries and improving surface performance.

Turf Replacement: When turf is nearing the end of its life, timely replacement is essential to avoid increased injury risks. Regular inspections and proactive maintenance should be undertaken to identify the signs of wear, such as unevenness, loss of fibre structure, or inadequate drainage.

8. Signs of End-of-Life Turf

Matted or Worn Fibers: When the fibres become flattened and worn, the cushioning effect is significantly reduced, increasing the hardness of the surface.

Infill Displacement: Infill that has compacted or spread unevenly across the pitch can lead to hard spots, making injuries more likely.

Visual Signs of Wear: Discoloration, exposed backing, or torn sections of the turf are clear indicators that the surface is reaching the end of its usability.

In summary, playing on a turf pitch without a shock absorber layer, or one that is coming to the end of its life, increases the risk of physical injuries, heat-related issues, and environmental exposure. Timely maintenance, refurbishment, and the installation of appropriate shock-absorbing layers are key to ensuring player safety and wellbeing.

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

**COMMITTEE &
PROPOSAL
NUMBER**

Environment 5

PROJECT TITLE

Playground Renovation & Surface Renewal

ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

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

Sam Whitehead/ Tony Foxwell

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme

Criteria

- Minimum required to continue to deliver the services of Council (e.g., Minimum level of building maintenance and IT).

Scope of Works

To carry out playground renovation works as playgrounds in poor condition to:

Hardwicks Yard - £39,521. Worse condition.

Chessington Road - £122,000. Third worse condition.

Shadbolt Park - £74,000.

Curtis Road - £60,000. Second worse condition.

Project outcomes and benefits

Benefits

Replacement of defective playground surfaces, replacement of defective equipment they are all at the end of their life, the safety surface has shrunk and is no longer safe. Works will allow children to play safely in the parks and repair and refurbish equipment which would not pass ROSPA safety standards.

Questions

Could Property confirm these works are an enhancement? Are there any nearby building developments? Would this work increase usage? If yes to both questions, could CIL funding be considered.

CIL funding was applied for, and the locations approved by CIL funding have been removed from this Capital proposal.

Request for info

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

	<p>Proposal should include a priority order and detail about the state/urgency of each park and related Health and Safety issues. Any playgrounds that have been successful in the recent CIL funding round at October LPPC Committee should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>The locations include a priority order and detail about the state/urgency of each park and related Health and Safety issues. Any playgrounds that have been successful in the recent CIL funding round at October LPPC Committee should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>Attached additional information.</p>
--	--

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
a	Estimated cost of purchase, works and/or equipment	300k	I have rounded up figure for ease.
b	Consultancy or other fees	30k	
c	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	330k	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	
e	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	330k	
f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Proposal (e-f)	330k	
h	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Savings as a Direct Result of the Project		

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

i	Annual Ongoing Revenue Additional Costs as a Direct Result of the Project		
---	---	--	--

Year	2025/26 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	Spend in summer 2025

REVENUE IMPACT

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Does the scheme meet any of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan targets, and if so, which ones?	No
--	----

STRATEGIC PLAN

Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Themes? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?	No
---	----

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	Jan/Feb 2025	TBA
2	Further Approvals Needed	N/A	TBA
3	Tendering (if necessary)	March 2025	TBA
4	Project start date	July/Aug 2025	TBA
5	Project Finish Date	Sept 2025	TBA

BASELINE CRITERIA

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

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

Spend to Save schemes should meet the following criteria:

- Payback of the amount capital invested within the project within 5 years (10 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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is it 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.</p>	<p>Yes the Playgrounds are deteriorating and may have to be shut due to Health and safety concerns if works do not proceed.</p>
<p>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.</p>	

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

<p>Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	------------

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

PRIORITISATION

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

1	Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.	Yes the Playgrounds are deteriorating and may have to be shut due to Health and safety concerns if works do not proceed.
2	Investment Important to achieve Key Priorities.	
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

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.)	No risks
2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	Have allowed for consultant's fees to deliver projects
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	Playgrounds are deteriorating and may have to be shut due to Health and safety concerns if works do not proceed.
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	Close Playgrounds

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of the who with and when by.	Yes will have to notify local residents when we are shutting the Playgrounds to carry out the works
--	---

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form

Ward(s) affected by the scheme	All
---------------------------------------	-----



Project Hardwicks Yard	Date: 27/06/23	Revision: 0	info@avarecreation.com www.avarecreation.com 08450 944 993 Orchard Craft, Orchard Road, South Wonston, Winchester SO21 3EX	
Title Proposed Play Area Improvements	Scale: 1:100 @ A3	Sheet: 1 of 1		
	Drawn By: C.P.S.	Notes: Concept Layout		

Capital Programme Review 2025-26

Project Appraisal Form