

2017/18 to 2020/21 CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME CAPITAL PROPOSAL FORMS

This Appendix contains the detailed information in support of the 2017/18 Capital Investment Programme summarised in Appendix B of the 2017/18 – 2021/22 Medium Term Resource Strategy report to Cabinet on 13 February 2017.

Contents

Prior Year Capital Investment planned for future years	2
Car Park Ticket machine Replacement	2
Shepton Mallet Cemetery Western Wall Rebuild	4
Procurement of a New Website Provider	6
eNgage Software	8
Shepton Mallet Cemetery Raised Burials.....	10
SQL Server Update for SharePoint	12
New Service Specific Capital Investment.....	14
Closed Churchyard Wall Repairs	14
Street Light Conversion to LED in Mendip car parks.....	16
Information Governance IT System.....	18
Modern Gov – Committee Decisions Software and Paperless Committees.....	20
Noise Monitoring Equipment	23
Annual Capital Expenditure Programme.....	25
Refuse Bin Replacement Programme	25
Car Park Resurfacing	27
Capital spend for Private Sector Housing via Disabled Facilities Grant	29

Prior Year Capital Investment planned for future years

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1516 – 4

Proposal Name:	Car Park Ticket machine Replacement
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Stuart Finney
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of the public, residents, businesses and visitors make use of Mendip car parks daily
Proposal Recommended:	Replacing the car park ticket machines ensures car park users are able to make payments in the manner that they choose, for example by cash (reflecting the change in size and shape of coins), card or phone. This helps to maintain and provide a vital amenity in Mendip's towns and an important revenue stream to the council.
Assumptions:	The car parks will remain in use as public car parks for the foreseeable future. Liaison with the property team will enable the appropriate targeting of car parks for rescheduling.
Options:	
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Replacement and enhancement of a vital asset which delivers an important service and achieves revenue to the council
	Service Impact External Users	Good parking experience for members of the public
	Service Impact Internal	Maintain revenue stream
	Other Implications as necessary	Maintain satisfactory levels in public car parks

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Failure to update ticket machines will lead to deterioration in the value of income collectable.
	Dependencies	None
	Constraints	None
	Capacity	

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)		100,000			
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18					
2018.19*		100,000			
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1516 - 6

Proposal Name:	Shepton Mallet Cemetery Western Wall Rebuild
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Mike Isherwood
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of the public, residents of Shepton Mallet area and their relatives, users of the cemetery.
Proposal Recommended:	The western boundary wall is in need of reconstruction following accumulated dilapidation through wear and tear and the effects of adjacent tree growth and works to remove large Leylandii trees from immediately adjacent. A more secure foundation is planned in order to ensure a more robust boundary for the long term future.
Assumptions:	All the adjacent Leylandii trees will be removed thus removing one of the principal causes of deterioration.
Options:	Railings instead of stone walling has been considered. This may cost only two thirds as much as the stone wall solution (estimated at about £55,000) but would require consent to change from the existing boundary type.
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Maintenance of Council Assets – sound asset management
	Service Impact External Users	Provides effective boundary for Shepton Mallet cemetery to benefit of cemetery users.
	Service Impact Internal	Core Services Contract may be utilised to provide wall building service
	Other Implications as necessary	The removal of mature Leylandii trees from the western boundary will enable proper maintenance of the graves in that part of the cemetery that have suffered damage from the tree growth.

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Not repairing the boundary (including removal of trees) will render some grave plots unusable, other existing graves remain in damaged condition and the cemetery boundary insecure. This will have reputational impact on the council and may lead to action against the council by affected relatives
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	Planning consent to remove all remaining Leylandii trees will need to be achieved
	Capacity	This work will be overseen by the Asset Maintenance Officer

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	85,000				
Revenue Contribution (b)	0				
Third Party Funding (c)	0				
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)	85,000				

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	45,000	40,000			
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1617 - 4

Proposal Name:	Procurement of a New Website Provider
Service:	Business Information Systems
Lead Officer:	Adam Rhymer
Stakeholders and Partners:	All services, members, Capita IT, 5 Council Partnership
Proposal Recommended:	Continue with existing supplies or procure a new one to provide a web solution that best suits The Council.
Assumptions:	Mendip need to find a supplier of a corporate Web Solution due to the current contract expiring in January 2018. This has already been extended for 12 months from January 2017 and cannot be extended again.
Options:	Depending on procurement options available: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue using the current provider 2. Procure the services of a new provider
Responsibilities:	BIS to further scope the market. BIS work with services and key staff members to ascertain what type of solution is required. Capita IT and 5 Council Partnership to provide advice guidance and information about their requirements and services required. Procurement to provide advice and guidance and assist with tendering process. Web supplier to identify their requirements

Impact	Strategic Impact	
	Service Impact External Users	Potential change in look and feel of solution which may have an impact on users both internal and external
	Service Impact Internal	All services: Requirement to scope and confirm needs Training on new on solution required for users BIS to procure, project manage, coordinate and assist in communication/ training needs IT to provide access and determine other related aspects as required
	Other Implications as necessary	None

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	None
	Dependencies	5 Councils transition plan Web Strategy Digital Strategy
	Constraints	BIS and IT resource plan in line with other projects and needs to tie in with the end date of the current contract extension
	Capacity	Would need to determine this alongside other projects and transition plan to 5 Councils.

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Annual Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	25,000				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18*	25,000				
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1617 - 9

Proposal Name:	eNgage Software
Service:	Compliance & Enforcement
Lead Officer:	Claire Malcolmson
Stakeholders and Partners:	
Proposal Recommended:	Northgate M3PP to be de-supported as Northgate move to a new browser based system. This system eNgage will supersede at no additional cost for the same functionality. If Mendip do not move to the new system the current software will become unsupported and gradually not be fit for purpose and an whole new system will be required to be procured. Preferred option is to move to eNgage and business case being prepared. Require capital to purchase new servers.
Assumptions:	Boundaries in terms of what is included and excluded from proposal
Options:	Purchase new data management system not researched as functionality of current system is fit for purpose and the move to eNgage combines the current M3PP package in a web based format with public facing screens and customer registration portal to provide a fully integrated system offering customers, partners (Police, contractors and other agencies) and Mendip staff, improved quality and access to information and services. This will encouraging customers to self serve through the Customer Portal on the Mendip website, they will be able to enter, save, retrieve, update and submit registrations, applications, renewals and objections/representations online, as well as make payment, attach supporting documentation, and monitor progress.
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Meets channel shift and supports reduction in regulatory burden for businesses.
	Service Impact External Users	Improved customer service and allows partners to self-service also
	Service Impact Internal	Will reduce low skill administrative support and allow development of back office staff to undertake a better support for professional and reduce the need for overtime at peak workload times
	Other Implications as necessary	Business case being prepared for IT support and CMT support. Current case indicates a return on investment within 2 years.

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Compliance, Enforcement, Private Sector Housing and Operational Assets & Contracts currently us the M3PP system and require a functioning data base to programme statutory work and record decision making processes. Also eNgage will allow applications on line and work towards compliance of EU Services Directive. Alternative do not currently enable full compliance with the directive.
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	Require BIS to project manage implementation
	Capacity	Included in business case but will require BIS support and Compliance Team back office support.

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	22,600				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	22,600				
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings	-9,970	-33,821	-33,821	-33,821	-33,821
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1617 – 10

Proposal Name:	Shepton Mallet Cemetery Raised Burials
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Stuart Finney
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of the public, residents of Shepton Mallet area and their relatives use the cemetery
Proposal Recommended:	Re-landscaping part of the cemetery to raise the ground level in order to provide more burial space when the cemetery is full.
Assumptions:	Cemetery will be full within two years. People still require burial space for their dead rather than using the local crematorium.
Options:	Obtaining a new plot of land in the vicinity of Shepton Mallet crematorium to lay out as a new burial ground.
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Allows the council to continue to provide a public burial service.
	Service Impact External Users	Prolongs the active useful life of Shepton Mallet cemetery.
	Service Impact Internal	Maintains a revenue stream from the cemetery that covers the cost of maintaining the asset.
	Other Implications as necessary	Enables the council to meet its statutory duties under the Public Health Act 1920 for public funded burials.

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Council may not be able to meet its obligations locally for public funded burials under the Public Health Act 1920.
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	
	Capacity	

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	45,000				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	45,000				
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1617 - 11

Proposal Name:	SQL Server Update for SharePoint
Service:	Business Information Systems
Lead Officer:	Carol Marchant
Stakeholders and Partners:	All services and some partners utilising MS SharePoint for document storage, sharing information and ordering works.
Proposal Recommended:	Purchase and install upgrade to SQL licences for Sharepoint as the existing SQL version (2005) becomes unsupported from 2016.
Assumptions:	IT have confirmed that the supported version of SQL Server licence to be installed will be compatible with the current version of SharePoint (2007).
Options:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do nothing – SQL support will end in 2016 and no further security patches will be available. This would leave a potential weakness within the Mendip network. 2. Combine with full upgrade of SharePoint. This will involve a major project with all services and is not deliverable prior to the end of life of SQL 2005.
Responsibilities:	Capita IT to be responsible for the successful delivery of the upgrade. MDC BIS to work with IT and all services to ensure user acceptance testing and issue resolution is successfully completed.

Impact	Strategic Impact	Mendip will be able to continue its use of SharePoint as its core information storage and sharing mechanism.
	Service Impact External Users	None – this is an internal system
	Service Impact Internal	Ensures database is supported and patched as necessary. Testing will be needed from SharePoint administrators.
	Other Implications as necessary	Upgrade of SQL server over 16-17 will assist in preparation for upgrade of SharePoint moving forward.

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	Resource availability for implementation and testing
	Capacity	This should not entail major change in the system or its configuration.

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	10,000				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	10,000				
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

New Service Specific Capital Investment

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 - 1

Proposal Name:	Closed Churchyard Wall Repairs
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Mike Isherwood
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of the public, users of churches and churchyards, PCC, Bath and Wells Diocese
Proposal Recommended:	<p>The District Council is obliged to maintain closed churchyards in decent order where they have been passed it by the Parochial Church Council in accordance with s215 of the Local Government Act 1972.</p> <p>A number of ancient stone boundary walls are in need of repairs that go beyond a simple re-pointing maintenance exercise and the works will require partial or substantial rebuilding with the introduction of new materials.</p>
Assumptions:	The Council can raise funds by precept to cover costs associated with closed churchyards known as Special Expenses.
Options:	<p>A number of churchyards have been identified as having high priority needs in respect of boundary wall repairs/rebuilding – these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croscombe, St Mary the Virgin – South wall • Nunney, All Saints – South wall • Pilton, St John the Baptist – North wall • Street, Holy Trinity – North wall
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Sound asset management
	Service Impact External Users	Provides a safe and well-ordered environment for users of closed churchyards
	Service Impact Internal	Core Services Contract may be utilised to provide wall building service
	Other Implications as necessary	

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Not repairing the boundary walls will reflect badly on the council as it has obligations under the LGA 1972 to keep closed churchyards in good repair
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	The Special Expenses precept is sometime capped to prevent excessive costs being applied to small parishes and this may affect some of the proposed works.
	Capacity	This work will be overseen by the Asset Maintenance Officer

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	83,500				
Revenue Contribution (b)	0				
Third Party Funding (c)	0				
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)	83,500				

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	43,500				
2018.19*		40,000			
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Special Expenses Rate	43,500	40,000			
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 - 2

Proposal Name:	Street Light Conversion to LED in Mendip car parks
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Mike Isherwood
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of public, drivers and pedestrians, that use Mendip car parks
Proposal Recommended:	The Council converts all of its car park lighting to modern LED fittings that are more efficient in use of electricity and cheaper to maintain and replace
Assumptions:	Replacement cost and running cost of LED lamps reduces to less than half the cost of SoN lamps currently in use.
Options:	Propose to convert two major car parks as a test case to see how effective they are. Suggest Northside and Southside car parks in Street are covered in first year and proceed to other car parks in future years
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Sound asset management Reduces environmental impact of car park lighting
	Service Impact External Users	The lighting should be as effective as the existing lights but will have slightly different appearance Failure rates of the lighting should reduce
	Service Impact Internal	Reduced failure of LED units will mean less complaint handling by Customer Services and Op Assets team
	Other Implications as necessary	Should result in an overall ongoing saving due to reduced running costs

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Lighting in Mendip car parks is necessary to achieve a safe and practical amenity for the public. Providing LED lighting will be more reliable and reduce risk due to lamp failure
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	
	Capacity	This work will be overseen by the Asset Maintenance Officer

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Request

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	58,500				
Revenue Contribution (b)	0				
Third Party Funding (c)	0				
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)	58,500				

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18	10,500	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contribution					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings		(550)	(1,200)	(1,800)	(2,400)
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 - 3

Proposal Name:	Information Governance IT System
Service:	Law & Governance
Lead Officer:	David Clark
Stakeholders and Partners:	Customers MDC staff Information Governance service
Proposal Recommended:	MDC currently receives over 600 access to information requests annually (FOI, DPA, EIR). The administration of these requests is labour intensive as is the associated interrogation of records. By utilising a bespoke IT system the requests can be more efficiently administered and an improved customer service achieved e.g. Manage My Request. The cost of the system and annual licence and maintenance charges are currently unknown and can only be estimated.
Assumptions:	IT Package Project Management IT support Ongoing maintenance and licensing
Options:	Do nothing
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Improved customer service and management of information Emerging Law & Governance operational plan
	Service Impact External Users	Automated acknowledgments, reminders, transparency on timescales will improve customer experience.
	Service Impact Internal	All FOI champions/service leads will require training on new system. Data/search platform will require alignment with existing back office systems
	Other Implications as necessary	Appropriate procurement process will be followed Assistance in producing specification will be required

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Including consultation requirements and potential impact of legal challenge
	Dependencies	Efficiencies in respect of staff time can be achieved and customer experience improved.
	Constraints	Timetable delays, e.g. planning or consultation issues
	Capacity	IT project management resource will be required either in-house or external.

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	30,000				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)	30,000				

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	30,000				
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure	10,000**	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

** Estimated on-going maintenance and support of software

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 – 4

Proposal Name:	Modern Gov – Committee Decisions Software and Paperless Committees
Service:	Law & Governance
Lead Officer:	David Clark
Stakeholders and Partners:	<p>Democratic Services, all committee reports authors, Elected Members – Council wide. Potential stage 2 of Shape Partnership Services with Taunton Dean Borough Council and West Somerset Council (Democratic Support and Elections).</p> <p>Ease of public access to Committee Meeting papers and Cllr information</p>
Proposal Recommended:	<p>Given the high level of Member and public participation in council meetings an accessible back office and public facing IT system is proposed. The system needs to be easy to access, update and use. This will also free up staff time to allow for increased Member support and advice.</p> <p>The proposal is to use Modern.gov which one of the UK's leading committee decision management systems. To embrace the full functionality and benefits of the software package it is also proposed to supply elected members with their own tablet device. This will enable revenue savings based on reduced printing and postage costs.</p> <p>Initial capital outlay of £15,000 for software and £12,500 for hardware (£250/tablet x 50 users).</p> <p>Ongoing annual £10,000 costs made up of licensing, maintenance and restricted app support).</p>
Assumptions:	<p>Initial capital outlay for software and hardware in year one.</p> <p>On-going year on year licensing/support and application costs are covered by proposed revenue contribution</p>
Options:	<p>Do nothing</p> <p>Alternative software provider</p> <p>Outsourcing service</p>
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Supporting modern governance Significantly enhance the experience of users and customers Greater accessibility/transparency Printing savings Efficiency savings (e.g. automated agenda/forward plan production, workflows, decision management, searching)
	Service Impact External Users	Greater accessibility to information for the public
	Service Impact Internal	Reduction in printing costs IT Support for Member Hardware Support for Software
	Other Implications as necessary	Covering other elements of key decision papers including health and well-being, organisational learning, partnership and procurement.

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Principal users have been briefed/seen demo and in-principle support received from senior members
	Dependencies	Adoption by users – avoiding paper copies Support from Capita IT services
	Constraints	Capacity of IT/BIS to support project alongside 5C's transition work
	Capacity	Project management within BIS Adoption and training of 'Super-users'

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	27,500				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)	27,500				

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18	27,500				
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 – 5

Proposal Name:	Noise Monitoring Equipment
Service:	Environmental Protection
Lead Officer:	Curtis Lakin
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of the public
Proposal Recommended:	Currently have 3 noise monitors but now need replacing in order to carry out statutory duty. Proposal is to replace 2 now in order to undertake work but consider replacing another one in the future to spread the cost and take advantage of technological advancements.
Assumptions:	Assumption that we replace 2 now and a further in future financial periods.
Options:	Require noise meters to undertake statutory work. There may be an option to hire but has not been investigated and may restrict working and response times.
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Able to carry out statutory duty using up to date and reliable equipment and support of health & wellbeing in the community (noise can be a stress factor affecting people's mental and physical health)
	Service Impact External Users	Failure to replace may prevent ability to carry out statutory duty and will impact residents within the district
	Service Impact Internal	The equipment is also used to ensure planning conditions complied and may support private sector housing so this work would not be completed as equipment becomes less reliable.
	Other Implications as necessary	

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Statutory service.
	Dependencies	Assumptions which if proved incorrect will jeopardise delivery of savings and pressures.
	Constraints	New equipment will need to be sourced against technical specification but needs to be done before aging equipment fails
	Capacity	Noise monitoring is part of the environmental protection officers' day job.

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Annual Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	37,500				
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18*	25,000				
2018.19*		12,500			
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2016.17 £	2017.18* £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Annual Capital Expenditure Programme

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 – 6

Proposal Name:	Refuse Bin Replacement Programme
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Stuart Finney
Stakeholders and Partners:	All households in Mendip (over 50,000) have domestic refuse bins many of which are now many years old and deteriorating in condition. This capital sum is to provide for replacement bins
Proposal Recommended:	Replace broken and lost bins across Mendip district with new wheelie bins.
Assumptions:	This sum allows for increased replacement rate over recent years as the bins deterioration progresses. Rate of replacement has been estimated by SWP staff.
Options:	The bins have to match the service provider's methodology and are specified by SWP. They will be compliant with the roll out of Recycle More if that goes ahead in 2017.
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	In supply enables the delivery of statutory service of waste collection
	Service Impact External Users	Householders need replacement bins at short notice in order to benefit from the waste and recycling service.
	Service Impact Internal	Waste and recycling queries are the most numerous source of contacts coming to the council through the customer services route
	Other Implications as necessary	Supports the Somerset Waste Partnership

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Failure to provide adequate replacement bins would lead to service failure of a vital statutory service leading to reputational damage
	Dependencies	
	Constraints	
	Capacity	

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18*	95,000				
2018.19*		95,000			
2019.20*			95,000		
2020.21*				95,000	
2021.22*					95,000

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021-22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 – 7

Proposal Name:	Car Park Resurfacing
Service:	Neighbourhood Services
Lead Officer:	Stuart Finney
Stakeholders and Partners:	Members of the public, residents, businesses and visitors make use of Mendip car parks daily
Proposal Recommended:	Resurfacing of car parks on a rolling programme ensures serviceable car parks are maintained and provide a vital amenity in Mendip's towns and an important revenue stream to the council.
Assumptions:	The car parks scheduled for resurfacing will remain in use as public car parks for the foreseeable future. Liaison with the property team will enable the appropriate targeting of car parks for rescheduling.
Options:	Car parks scheduled for resurfacing include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Johns car park, Glastonbury – phase 2 • Northload Street, Glastonbury
Responsibilities:	

Impact	Strategic Impact	Maintenance of a vital asset which delivers an important service and achieves revenue to the council
	Service Impact External Users	Good parking experience for members of the public
	Service Impact Internal	Maintain revenue stream
	Other Implications as necessary	Maintain satisfactory levels of health and safety in public car parks

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Failure to maintain car park surfaces will lead to deterioration that raises the risk of accidents and damaged vehicles and possible trip and fall hazards to pedestrians crossing the area.
	Dependencies	None
	Constraints	None
	Capacity	Works will be procured by Asset Maintenance Officer and or Engineer and make use of Core Services Contract

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)					
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)					

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19 £	2019.20 £	2020.21 £	2021.22 £
2017.18	40,000				
2018.19*		40,000			
2019.20*			40,000		
2020.21*				40,000	
2021.22*					40,000

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Ring Fenced Grant					
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)

Capital MTRS 2017/18 to 2021/22 Proposal Document

Ref: C1718 – 8

Proposal Name:	Capital spend for Private Sector Housing via Disabled Facilities Grant
Service:	Housing
Lead Officer:	Andy Eisenhauer
Stakeholders and Partners:	The Better Care Fund (BCF) is allocated centrally by Somerset County Council each year according to need per district. The BCF allocation is to be used mainly for mandatory Disabled Facility Grants (DFG) and Decent Home Grants to vulnerable homeowners, plus for housing repair / improvement initiatives in the private sector.
Proposal Recommended:	The need for repairs and improvements to disabled and vulnerable home owners in the private sector is evident and meets the council's stated Core Priority for Improve the health and wellbeing of the residents and communities of Mendip. The large majority of the capital Spend in private sector housing is for DFGs which are mandatory grants.
Assumptions:	The BCF allocated to MDC is not guaranteed each year and may vary. MDC contribution (top-up funds) is essential to meet the demand.
Options:	There are no other options
Responsibilities:	Mandatory DFG and discretionary grant in accordance with stated Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy

Impact	Strategic Impact	Optimise the use of the capital spend for private sector housing to those most in need and help meet the MDC commitment for Housing within the district
	Service Impact External Users	Benefits the disabled and vulnerable in the district and supports our contractual partner Home Improvement Agency and local (mainly Somerset) building contractors
	Service Impact Internal	Administered by private sector housing in the Housing Group with incidental admin by Planning and BCOs and finally Capita / finance admin
	Other Implications as necessary	Mandatory DFG admin required and MDC in contractual relationship with other Somerset districts and County and the county-wide Home Improvement Agency

Risk	Statutory / Regulatory	Mentioned above
	Dependencies	If funding from Better Care fund and /or MDC are not forthcoming the MDC commitment to private sector housing renewal will not be met.
	Constraints	None other than funding must be in place at start of each financial year
	Capacity	Staff resources need to be maintained to administrate Policy

Capital Investment Programme 2017/18 – 2021/22 Financial Information

Overall Scheme Requests

	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Total Cost of Scheme (a)	951,000	951,000	951,000	951,000	951,000
Revenue Contribution (b)					
Third Party Funding (c)	(701,000)	(701,000)	(701,000)	(701,000)	(701,000)
Required MDC Resources (a-b-c)	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000

(* indicative years)

Estimated profile of Scheme (when the spend will be incurred)

Total Capital Outlay (a)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*	951,000				
2018.19*		951,000			
2019.20*			951,000		
2020.21*				951,000	
2021.22*					951,000

(* indicative years)

Breakdown of Third Party Funding

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
Contributions					
Un- Ring Fenced Grant	(701,000)	(701,000)	(701,000)	(701,000)	(701,000)
Section 106					
CIL					
LEP					

(* indicative years)

Total Revenue Contributions (b)

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
2017.18*					
2018.19*					
2019.20*					
2020.21*					
2021.22*					

(* indicative years)

Revenue Implications

£	2017.18 £	2018.19* £	2019.20* £	2020.21* £	2021.22* £
On Going Savings					
One off Savings					
On Going Pressure					
One off Pressure					

(* indicative years)