

Capital Programme Review 2018-19

Project Appraisal Form

**COMMITTEE &
BID NUMBER**

Environment Bid 2

PROJECT TITLE

Repair to St Mary's Churchyard Flint faced wall.

ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

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

Sue Bonner/Rod Brown

DETAILS OF PROJECT

Project scope, what is included/excluded in the scheme

To carry out significant repairs to a flint faced Grade 2 listed perimeter Churchyard wall. There has been significant movement of the wall structure, resulting in the crumbling of the rendering, displacement of some coping stones and subsequent loss of brick and flint in certain areas along the wall. Most notably opposite Ewell Castle School and London Road. A structural engineers report advises repairs to the wall to include re-pointing, and rebuilding of certain sections to prevent continued deterioration and eventual collapse. Please see attached report and photographs.

Project outcomes and benefits

To ensure public safety and the safety of the Contractors who maintain the Churchyard, to comply with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. To comply with Section 215 of the Local Government Act 1972 which requires the Council to maintain the closed Churchyard grounds which includes keeping walls and fences in good repair. To carry out one of the Council's key priorities of helping to support a community resource. To minimise disruption to the services and events at St Marys Church. Ensuring that we achieve the Council's core values of forward thinking and managing resources by planning ahead, to allow for any faculty application that may be required. Protecting a historic listed wall. The

Capital Programme Review 2018-19

Project Appraisal Form

	Churchyard itself is a valued amenity serving the local community. It is accessed by several public foot paths, with the perimeter wall bordering a bus route along the busy London Road and residential Church Street where Ewell Castle School is situated. It would be prudent to consider a planned programme of repair to avoid the possibility of emergency works and the disruption and extra costs this may incur.
--	--

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	72,450	
b	Consultancy or other fees	5,000	Diocese faculty to perform work to the church wall. An application for Listed Building Consent may be required and further advice may be needed if human remains are exposed during the course of the work.
c	Total Scheme Capital Costs (a+b)	77,450	
d	External Funding Identified (e.g. s106, grants etc.) Please give details, including any unsuccessful funding enquiries you may have made.	0	Enquiries for supportive funding were made with both the Lottery Fund and the National Heritage Fund but were unsuccessful. The Church has been approached to contribute to the cost of repairing the wall and their response is awaited. Given the council's statutory duty it is thought unlikely that funds will be forthcoming.
e	Net Costs to Council (c-d)	77,450	

Capital Programme Review 2018-19 Project Appraisal Form

f	Internal Sources of Capital Funds Identified (e.g. repairs & renewals reserve etc.)	0	
g	Capital Reserves Needed to Finance Bid (e-f)	77,450	
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	Review budget to reflect higher future maintenance costs of the wall	

Year	2018/19 £	2019/20 £	2020/21 £
Spend Profile of Scheme – please identify which year (s) the scheme spend will fall into	77,450	0	0

REVENUE IMPACT

Can revenue implications be funded from the Committee Base Budget? – Please give details	None
--	------

Capital Programme Review 2018-19

Project Appraisal Form

CORPORATE PLAN 2016/20

<p>Is this investment linked to EEBC's Key Priorities? If so, say which ones and evidence how. How does project fit within service objectives?</p>	<p>Managing our Resources – taking timely action now will reduce the need for greater capital funding in years ahead.</p> <p>Keeping our Borough Clean and Green – Repairing the wall will ensure the environment around the church is safe and attractive for future generations.</p> <p>Supporting our Community – The church community is a vital part of community life.</p>
---	---

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 2018	May 2018
2	Further Approvals Needed	April 2018	May 2018
3	Tendering (if necessary)	April 2018	May 2018
4	Project start date	May 2018	July 2018
5	Project Finish Date	October 2018	March 2019

BASELINE CRITERIA

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. 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 (7 years for renewable energy projects).

Capital Programme Review 2018-19

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>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>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.</p>	<p>Yes. Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 – as there is risk to public should the wall collapse. Plus further statutory duty as set out in Section 215 of the Local Govt Act 1972.the Council has a Legal responsibility to maintain the wall in good repair.</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>	

Capital Programme Review 2018-19

Project Appraisal Form

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Is investment identified in the Council's Asset Management Plan?	N/A
--	-----

PRIORITISATION

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

1	Investment essential to meet statutory obligation.	It raises Health and Safety Concerns considering its close proximity to two Schools whose students use the public footpaths as a cut through into town and the public highway. The Council could be in breach of its duty to maintain the wall under Section 2 of the Local Govt Act 1972.
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.)	Delay: The ground levels adjacent to the flint wall in the Churchyard are considerably higher than the flint wall on the pavement level. Work that involves excavation will need to be carried out sensitively and with care bearing in mind that there are graves in close proximity to the proposed works. This might delay progress on repairing the wall as discussions with the church and additional measures may be needed to manage human remains and protect public decency. Budget risks include the need for additional advice or consultancy and any specialist services to reinter human remains.
---	---	--

Capital Programme Review 2018-19

Project Appraisal Form

2	Are there any risks relating to the availability of resources internally to deliver this project	No as the work will be contracted out.
3	Consequences of not undertaking this project	The structural engineers report lists the repairs required. Failure to carry out repairs will only contribute to the wall deteriorating further with eventual wall collapse. This may injure members of the public or contractors, with the possible risk of litigation. Any collapse in the walls structure will involve emergency repairs and securing the area with fencing etc. to protect the public which would have increased costs to those set out in this bid.
4	Alternative Solutions (Other solutions considered – cost and implications)	Additional sources of funding have been explored.

Is consultation required for this project? Please give details of who with and when by.	Consultation with the Diocese and their explicit approval through a Diocesan Faculty to carry out the work. This has already been discussed with the church, which is supportive but we would have to acquire the Faculty prior to commencement of work.
--	--

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