

APPENDIX A

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR

CAPITAL PROGRAMME APPRAISAL WORKING GROUP

- (i) Consider the likely level of capital resources and advise on the consequent level of capital programmes.
- (ii) Evaluate the comparative merits of proposed capital schemes and recommend priorities to the Cabinet and Policy and Services Committee.
- (iii) Monitor the progress of approved capital programmes, giving consideration to minor variations of individual schemes.
- (iv) Receive post implementation reports on major capital schemes.
- (v) Prepare the draft medium term capital programme for consideration by the Cabinet and Policy and Services Committee.
- (vi) Prepare the draft annual Capital Strategy submission to the Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR).

CAPITAL AND SPECIAL WORKS PROJECT FUNDING FORM
for larger projects (above £50,000)

PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION



PROJECT STRUCTURE AND SPONSOR

Give details of the project structure below

Project Sponsor	Name	Job Title	Telephone No.
The sponsor supports the project at Management Team and in Committees and monitors project costs with the Project Board (where applicable). Usually the Director or a Second Tier Officer.	LINDA GOLIGHTLY	CHIEF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER	2204
Project Manager	MARK PLEDGER	EH MANAGER	2209
Project Team	Name	Title	Telephone No.
The Project Team may only be one person, or a group of people representing the users.	MARK PLEDGER	EH MANAGER	2209
	LOUISE NEWELL	TECH SUPPORT ANALYST	2010
	MIKE CHAPPELL	IT TECH ANALYST	2018
	ROBIN KENNEDY	EHO	2221
	MIKE ROSS	EH ADMIN OFFICER	2281
	ANDY LONGLEY	EHO	2210
	DIANE CROUCHER	EHO	2208
Project Board	Name	Job Title	Telephone No.
The Project Board is used with larger projects to help the sponsor take a strategic overview of the project and ensure that the project team is functioning correctly.	LINDA GOLIGHTLY	CHIEF EHO	2204
	MARK PLEDGER	EH MANAGER	2209
	ALAN HARGREAVES	ENV SER. MANAGER	2205
	MIKE ROSS	EPT. ADMIN. MAN.	2281
	SUE BLANKS	IT BUS. MANAGER	2017
External Consultants	Name	Company	Telephone No.
If you are using external consultants put their details here.			
Project Sign Off	Name	Job Title	Telephone No.
Who will sign off the completed project - usually projects are signed off by the Sponsor.	LINDA GOLIGHTLY	CHIEF EHO	2204

PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE(S)

What is / are the reason(s) for the investment and what benefits would be provided to service users / providers ?

To implement the replacement of the current Environmental Health Database to provide a more efficient, up to date system, which meets the Department's and user's requirements for fast and reliable access to information and should include the following:-

- The facility to log requests for service on the full range of environmental health topics including access via the web.
- The option to increase service access and take-up by having the ability to generate more detailed analysis of service provision.
- The capability of providing time and cost-centre based financial management information relating to officer activities.
- The ability to interface with a range of GIS, Office Automation and Graphics Packages.
- Total integration between modules, allowing free movement between the database and individual applications using the minimum of keystrokes.
- A wide range of standard reporting mechanisms, including CIEH, MAFF, CIPFA and FSA returns, together with standard reports for management and "Best Value" purposes.
- The facility to download information onto a palm top or lap top computer for use in the field.
- Web enabled to allow development of Internet services at a future date.
- Ability to interact with Councils other departmental and service based systems particularly FMS.

• The possible need to act as contractor to other agencies

• The possibility of extensive change to keep pace with new legislation, advances in technology and methods of operation. A relational database is preferred which should allow design and growth flexibility

CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

Which key themes are met, and how ?

All projects should help achieve DDC key themes

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To improve transportation links to, from and within the District from its 1999 level2. Local public transport within, to and from the District and through the District will have been improved from its 1999 level3. There will be equality of access to all public services, building, areas and information throughout the District4. Pollution levels will have decreased from their 1999 levels5. The key aims of the Local Agenda 21 strategy will have been achieved including reducing waste, encouraging recycling and energy efficiency, promotion of the countryside and protection of wildlife6. More affordable housing7. Improved health measures from 1999 levels8. A reduction in crime and people will be less worried about crime9. Communities with the confidence and ability to act for themselves10. The unemployment rate for the District will be below the regional average and the number of job opportunities will have increased from 1999 levels11. Dover Town Investment Zone will be complete, colliery sites used and plans for the 'Sandwich Corridor' implemented12. Education and skills levels will be at or above the Kent average | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|---|--|

BACKGROUND

What is the project background to date ?

The current Environmental Health database is now eight years old and was developed in-house at a time when commercial packages were not fully developed. Little development work has occurred on the system in the last few years.

The EHCS currently consists of three main modules that have some inter-connectivity. All three are linked to a property database sourced from Council Tax records, each property having a unique property reference number UPRN.

The system has significant limitations, particularly as it is not Windows based and, therefore, cannot interact with any of the Council's other standard operating systems. Functionality is limited and users generally dislike it.

There are significant missing elements including a Grant calculation facility, a licensing module and tools for infectious disease and sampling investigations. A daily diary is not included, which is important for both staff monitoring and work scheduling.

As a management tool, it has severe limitations and all but standard reports have to be written by IT. Annual reports are not reportable directly from the database.

The system does not cope with the ever-increasing demands of best value and as new legislation is added the system can not support the officers in their duties.

A new package system would have up to date modules with significantly lower development costs supported by user groups who know what refinements may be required.

OTHER OPTIONS

**What options have you considered ?
Please explain why any other option has been discounted**

Discussions have been held with IT about the possibility of adapting the current system. This has been rejected on the grounds that it would take at least one person a full year to rewrite the programme, and the benefits to be gained would not be significant enough to justify the cost.

PROJECT SCOPE

How long do you think that the completed project is likely to be of benefit ?

The project will include all the deliverables associated with an open database system, including hardware, software, interfaces and user training. The system will be upgradeable but in any event should suffice for at least seven years.

ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT

What will happen if all or part of the funding cannot be provided ?

The Environmental Health Database is central to the operation of the Environmental Health Division and is used by over 30 people in a number of different ways. Although the system will be purchased as a package, there will be a significant IT requirement in the first year as any new system will require configuration to meet specific DDC requirements. As the system has many different functions, these will need to be set up for particular client groups and users, e.g. access to statutory Notice removal will need to be controlled. Evidence from other Local Authorities suggests that due to diversity of environmental health databases, the IT personnel input can be significant.

If the funding can not be provided the existing system will have to continue as it stands. Service standards will drop progressively over coming years and no progress towards web enablement will be made. Restricted funding would result in a basic system which might not be suitable in the long term.

RISKS

Consider the following example issues:

Health and Safety

Insurance

Security

Out of Hours Provision

Do any of them impact on the project ?

If so please give details and indicative costs

Risks would primarily lie within the Environmental Health division. Failure of the system would result in:-

- Failure to undertake statutory inspections in accordance with Local and National Policy.
- Loss of detailed premises records.
- Delays to processing of work.
- Failure to collate statutory and non statutory statistical information.
- Reduction in management control due to lack of information.
- Inability to benchmark accurately against other local authorities and consequent unlikely to provide best value.

CONSTRAINTS

Are there any constraints (other than lack of funding) ?

No

TIMESCALES AND DELIVERABLES

What is your timetable for each stage of the project ?

Significant effort has been made to research the 'market' and all known suppliers have given demonstrations of their product (see appendix B). Once funding has been secured it is anticipated that it will take 14 months before the project can be fully implemented.

The main stages of the project will be:-

- 1 Preparation of Specification including consultation with
- 2 The procurement process including supplier responses on site demonstrations and evaluation of initial responses.
- 3 Tendering of remaining suppliers and awarding of contract.

INSURANCE COVER

What insurance cover is required for this project ?

None

REVENUE IMPLICATIONS

Describe what will be the ongoing revenue implications of the project, e.g. additional staffing costs

Annual licence/maintenance fee of between £6000 and £10000. Some systems incur no upfront costs but are paid by means of a larger annual licence.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Are there going to be any additional replacement or development costs during the life span of the project once completed ?

Depending on the initial specification there may be a requirement to make the system web enabled during the course of its life. Other upgrades will be provided as part of the annual licence.

COSTS

INCOME FROM OUTSIDE BODIES	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
National Lottery						
ERDF						
Konver						
SRB						
Other (please specify)						
Total						

CAPITAL COSTS:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Consultancy	1500					1500
Purchase of equipment	59385					59385
Contractor's costs						
Planning fee						
External legal fees						
Internal fees						
Architects						
Engineers - District						
Engineers - Highways						
Engineers - Recreation						
Building Surveyors						
Legal						
PTS Administration						
H and H Administration						
Other (please specify)	6000					6000
Total	66885					66885

REVENUE IMPLICATIONS	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Mtce fee	8000	8000	8000	8000	8000	40000
Reduction in IT support costs						
Total	8000	8000	8000	8000	8000	40000

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title:		Project No.	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM			
Factor	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS			
CORPORATE OBJECTIVES Weighting = 5	Fully supports more than one of the Corporate Objectives of this Council	4	20 (Evidence to support the ranking is only required if it is not obvious how the scheme meets the Corporate Objectives (x-ref to Capital and Special Works Funding Form Page 6)). Agenda 21 – less paper output, Agenda 21 strategy will be considered in the system arrangements Improved health measures from 1999 levels – currently not able to access measures for some areas of work (eg: food hygiene)
	Project/Scheme objectives are consistent with one Corporate Objectives	3	
	Project/Scheme objectives are only partially consistent with one or more of the Corporate Objectives	2	
	Project/Scheme objectives are not consistent with Corporate Objectives	1	

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title:		Project No.	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM			
Factor	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY Weighting = 3	Community and Regeneration: Contribute towards industrial regeneration/job creation, and/or leisure/commercial facilities for the community, and/or addresses a social concern which benefits all residents	5	9
	Community and Environment: Contribute towards improved housing stock for the community, and/or the preservation of the local environment	3	
	Community: Contribute towards improved community safety / addresses a social concern (vandalism, homelessness, crime) benefiting an individual area	2	
	Opportunity and Access: Improved access and facilities for the disabled	1	
		Evidence to support Assessment	
		Main Health and Housing database – includes Housing related grants and Housing enforcement work. It is anticipated that an effective database will assist in Housing regeneration and Housing preservation.	

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title:		Project No.	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM			
Factor	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
PUBLIC SATISFACTION/ PERCEPTION Weighting = 4	Recent consultation demonstrates a high level of support for the project or scheme	4	16 <i>(The level of consultation should be proportionate to the level of expenditure and the potential sensitivity of the project or scheme)</i> Not applicable to get public support. Internal support from both the Health and Housing department and IT demonstrates a high level of support for a new computer system, as the existing system cannot be satisfactorily upgraded to meet urgent requirements.
	Recent consultation demonstrates overall support for the project or scheme	3	
	Recent consultation demonstrates some support for the project or scheme or no consultation undertaken	2	
	Recent consultation revealed a high level of objection to the project or scheme	1	
		Evidence to support Assessment	

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title:		Project No.	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM			
Factor	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
STATUTORY REQUIREMENT	All of the Project or Scheme is statutorily required	4	12 <i>(if ranked as 4 or 2, give details of the relevant legislation or legal implications)</i>
	Part of the Project or Scheme is statutorily required	2	
	None of the Project or Scheme is statutorily required	1	
COST EFFECTIVENESS	Cost of capital employed will be offset by a positive contribution from the project/scheme to the future revenue stream (e.g. income from the project or reduction in current revenue costs) = low total net cost	4	6 No income receivable from project No additional revenue costs
	Cost of capital employed will not be further eroded by revenue costs from the project/scheme = medium total net cost	2	
	Cost of capital employed will be further eroded by future revenue running costs = high total net cost (exclude CFCs)	1	
Weighting = 3			

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title:		Project No.	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM			
Factor	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
FINANCIAL IMPACT Weighting = 4	Project/Scheme will stop significant financial loss to the revenue budget (>£20,000 per annum and/or attract significant financial support (80-100% of the required funding)	5	4
	Project/Scheme will stop substantial financial loss to the revenue budget (£10,000 to £19,999 per annum), and/or attract substantial financial support (50 - 79% of the required funding)	3	
	Project/Scheme will reduce the financial loss to the revenue budget (< £9,999 per annum), and/or attract limited financial support (25 - 49% of the required funding)	2	
	Project/Scheme will have no impact on or will increase the financial loss to the revenue budget, a nd/or attract low level financial support (up to 24% of the required funding)	1	

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title: ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM		Project No.	
Factor IMPACT ON SERVICE OR OTHER SERVICES Weighting = 1 Choose from the list below the statement that best describes the project or scheme and apply that ranking score.	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
	Project/Scheme will: Remove the effects of dilapidation and neglect or Raise awareness of positive aspects of the area (heritage, facilities) or Contribute towards improved operational service delivery	5	5
	Recent audit or inspection has revealed some management and service performance weaknesses	4	
	Project scheme will: Prevent future high maintenance or support costs	3	
	Project scheme will: Improve the aesthetic impact of the surroundings or Address health and safety requirements	2	
Evidence to support Assessment			

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
Capital Appraisal Scoring Analysis

Project Title:		Project No.	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPUTER SYSTEM			
Factor	Scale of Measurement	Rank	Score
OVERALL MEASUREMENT:			
		72	DATE OF ASSESSMENT: 11 JULY 2001
Project Manager: MARK PLEDGER		Accountant: LOUISE BIRCH	
		<i>Louise Birch</i>	

APPENDIX C
PROJECTED CAPITAL AND REVENUE SCHEMES RESOURCING STATEMENT 2001/02

CAPITAL SCHEMES	£000				
	Housing		Other services		Total
	HRA	GF	Allocated	Available	
Basic credit approval	0	595	635		1,230
Supplementary credit approvals					
Partnership Funding of SRB III			100		100
Partnership Funding of SRB V			98		98
Beach Response Management (55%)			61		61
Coastal Defence Strategy (55%)			13		13
Kingsdown Sea Defences (45%)			45		45
Coast Protection, Oldstairs Bay (45%)			706		706
Deal Overtopping (45%)			23		23
Disabled facilities grants		163			163
LESS: Specified Capital Grant		-163			-163
Direct revenue financing - HRA	110				110
Major Repairs Allowance - HRA	3,028				3,028
Capital receipts					
Brought forward at 1 April 2001			45	175	220
Anticipated in 2001/02		134	872	0	1,006
Grants					
Disabled Facilities Grants SCG		163			163
Beach Response Management (45%)			49		49
Coastal Defence Strategy (45%)			11		11
Kingsdown Sea Defences (55%)			55		55
Oldstairs Bay (55%)			863		863
Deal Overtopping (55%)			27		27
Grand Shaft Barracks (SEEDA)			23		23
Deal Dryside (National Lottery)			707		707
Deal Dryside (Walmer Parish Council)			1		1
Outstanding Creditors 2000/01	-18	-7	-278		-303
Reserves					
Capital Creditors	18				18
Car Parking			150		150
	3,138	885	4,206	175	8,404

REVENUE SCHEMES	HRA	GF	Allocated	Available	Total
HRA Repairs and Maintenance	2,911				2,911
Capital and special projects reserve			353		353
	2,911	0	353	0	3,264

TOTAL RESOURCES	6,049	885	4,559	175	11,668
------------------------	--------------	------------	--------------	------------	---------------

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED EXPENDITURE PROGRAMMES

Capital Schemes					
- as per attached schedule					8,229
Revenue Schemes					
- as per attached schedule					3,264
Sum available for new allocations					175
TOTAL EXPENDITURE					11,668

APPENDIX C

CAPITAL AND SPECIAL REVENUE SCHEMES PROGRAMME 2001/02

	Original Approved Scheme Total	Actual Expenditure		Total to date	PRIOR YEARS	2001/02 to date	PRIOR YEARS	Approved Budget		SCHEME TOTAL
		£	£					£	£	
CAPITAL SCHEMES										
Community General Fund	£									
Deal Dry Side construction	700,000	164,535	110,426	274,961	164,535	1235,465	164,535	1,235,465	0	1,400,000
Youth Spaces	185,000	47,351	22,017	69,368	47,351	137,849	47,351	137,849	0	185,000
Kearsney Abbey Tea Rooms major repairs	250,000	0	454	454	0	250,000	0	250,000	0	250,000
Deal Tennis Centre - replacement equipment	16,100	0	0	0	0	16,100	0	16,100	0	16,100
Deal Pier	2,663,000	0	0	0	0	67,000	0	67,000	2,596,000	2,663,000
Community General Fund - Housing	n/a	n/a	223,257	223,257	n/a	700,000	n/a	700,000	n/a	700,000
Renovation Grants										
Housing Association Schemes:										
Redsull Avenue/ Davis Avenue, Deal	138,000	111,000	0	111,000	111,000	28,000	0	28,000	0	139,000
North Deal Community Centre	0	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000	0	25,000
St. Radigunds Early Years Centre	30,000	0	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000	0	30,000
22 Granville Street, Dover	0	0	0	0	0	35,000	0	35,000	0	35,000
Environmental Health - database	66,885	0	0	0	0	66,885	0	66,885	0	66,885
Community - HRA	n/a	n/a	936,102	936,102	n/a	3,138,000	n/a	3,138,000	n/a	3,138,000
Major Repairs Schemes										
Environment and Public Protection										
Work to public conveniences at Deal Pier and Granville Road (1998/99)	69,000	62,049	0	62,049	62,049	16,100	0	16,100	0	78,149
Coast Protection Schemes:										
Kingsdown sea defences	1,798,000	100	0	100	100	100,000	100	100,000	1,375,000	1,475,100
Coastal defence strategy 2000-2005 (45% grant)	50,000	45,552	1,242	46,794	45,552	23,831	45,552	23,831	0	69,383
Beach Response Management System (45% grant)	220,000	96,940	8,871	105,811	96,940	109,722	96,940	109,722	135,000	341,662
Oldstairs Bay, Kingsdown (56% grant)	1,212,950	218,467	30,218	248,685	218,467	1,568,533	218,467	1,568,533	0	1,787,000
Deal overtopping	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000	450,000	500,000
MOD realignment study	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	100,000
Transport, Opportunity and Access										
Footway Lighting - new installations	325,000	169,928	10,132	180,060	169,928	80,072	169,928	80,072	75,000	325,000
Regeneration										
Single Regeneration Budget III	300,000	0	0	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	50,000	150,000
Grand Shaft Barracks Site - land reclamation programme (1998/99)	383,040	316,922	2,562	319,484	316,922	23,485	316,922	23,485	0	340,407
Single Regeneration Budget V	250,000	0	0	0	0	98,000	0	98,000	98,000	198,000
Finance and Scrutiny										
Cabling at Whitfield Offices	250,000	381,892	20,855	412,747	381,892	21,358	381,892	21,358	0	413,250
Impact										
Capital Grants	628,730	619,161	692	619,853	619,161	9,569	619,161	9,569	0	628,730
	n/a	n/a	37,860	37,860	n/a	299,032	n/a	299,032	0	299,032
TOTAL CAPITAL SCHEMES	9,545,705	2,243,897	1,404,688	3,648,585	2,243,897	8,228,801	2,243,897	8,228,801	4,879,000	15,351,698

APPENDIX C

MEMORANDUM SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL GRANTS - 2001/02

	Actual Expenditure			Approved Budget			GRANT %	
	PRIOR YEARS	2001/02 To Date	TOTAL TO DATE	PRIOR YEARS	2001/02 Budget	TOTAL GRANT		TOTAL PROJECT COST
	£	£	£	£	£	£		£
Community								
Sandwich Sports and Leisure Centre - new facilities	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000	827,000	
Downs Sailing Club - club house extension and boats purchase	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	72,025	
St.Radigns County Primary School - multi-use games area	0	9,000	9,000	0	18,500	18,500	49,500	
Eythorne PC - Professional fees re Youth Space, Eivington	2,900	0	2,900	2,900	700	3,600	3,600	
St Margarets at Cliffe PC - play equipment replacement	2,652	0	2,652	2,652	0	2,652	6,992	
Deal Wanderers Rugby Sports and Social Club - new clubhouse	0	0	0	0	20,000	20,000	341,000	
Eythorne Parish Council - replacement of play equipment	0	0	0	0	1,875	1,875	4,750	
Charles Sports Ground Charity	0	0	0	0	10,785	10,785	10,785	
Alkham PC - Purchase of Vicarage Meadows	933	0	933	933	67	1,000	2,350	
River PC - Refurbish Recreation Ground Changing Facilities	0	262	262	0	1,500	1,500	216,000	
Motor Cross Challenge Project 2000	0	0	0	0	20,000	20,000	81,856	
Deal Town Football Club - Safety Works	0	3,522	3,522	0	5,000	5,000	15,500	
Dover Bowling Club - Extension to clubhouse	0	0	0	0	2,500	2,500	14,300	
Sandwich Town Cricket Club - pavilion improvements	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000	170,000	
River Parish Council - refurbishment recreation grd facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Regeneration								
Sandwich Bay Transmanche Field Centre	10,000	9,673	19,673	10,000	10,000	20,000	306,000	
Dover Roman Painted House - new entrance	0	1,217	1,217	0	3,645	3,645	7,930	
Finance & Scrutiny								
Eivington, Eythorne Village Hall - new hall	54,677	0	54,677	54,677	5,323	60,000	225,000	
St Margarets Village hall - rebuilding of hall plus extension	0	8,999	8,999	0	30,000	30,000	280,000	
Hougham Hall - external works	2,579	0	2,579	2,579	421	3,000	8,538	
Betteshanger Social Club - renovations to provide a community centre	0	0	0	0	5,000	5,000	112,222	
Dover District Volunteer Bureau - relocation costs	1,120	292	1,412	1,120	292	1,412	7,500	
Northbourne Parish Hall	0	0	0	0	2,350	2,350	4,705	
Dover Transport Museum Society	0	0	0	0	30,000	30,000	250,000	
Millennium Grants (allocated)	81,256	4,895	86,151	81,256	22,004	103,260	n/a	
Balance unallocated	0	0	0	0	81,570	81,570	0	
TOTAL CAPITAL GRANTS (transferred to Capital Schemes Statement)	156,117	37,860	193,977	156,117	299,032	455,149		

APPENDIX C

CAPITAL AND SPECIAL REVENUE SCHEMES PROGRAMME 2001/02

	Original Approved Scheme Total	Actual expenditure			Approved Budget			SCHEME TOTAL
		PRIOR YEARS	2001/02 to date	Total to date	PRIOR YEARS	2001/02 Budget	FUTURE YEARS	
<u>SPECIAL REVENUE SCHEMES</u>								
<u>Transport, Opportunity and Access</u>								
Maintenance of footway lighting	75,000	68,021	0	68,021	6,979	0	75,000	
<u>Regeneration</u>								
White Cliffs Experience - future use feasibility study	40,000	25,511	0	25,511	14,489	0	40,000	
SRB staff - premises transfer expenses	9,000	6,973	0	6,973	2,027	0	9,000	
Asset Management Plan - building condition surveys	30,000	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000	
<u>Community - HRA</u>								
Repairs and maintenance	3,100,000	0	693,151	693,151	2,911,000	n/a	2,911,000	
<u>Finance and Scrutiny</u>								
Planned maintenance of Whitfield Council Offices	300,000	0	0	0	300,000	0	300,000	
TOTAL CAPITAL SCHEMES	3,554,000	100,505	693,151	793,656	3,264,495	0	3,365,000	