

Meeting: Capital Programme Working Group**Date: 9th November 2010****Attendees: Steve Udberg (SU), Monica Coffey (MC), Margaret Bailey (MB), Darryl Smith (DS), Mark Stanton (MS), Mark Finch (MF), Ralph Burton (RB)****Apologies: Kim Parks(KP), Stephen Askew, Claire Bowes**

	Owner
<p>1 - Minutes of last meeting 10-07</p> <p>As meetings in July and September were cancelled due to non attendance, last minutes for consideration were 19th May which were agreed.</p> <p>General discussion took place re status of group and how can funding be released with no Members present and what is status of group? There were two requests for funding on agenda so this is an important issue and it was agreed that funding would be requested via blue forms and MF would highlight the issues of attendance at the group with Maxine and Stephen Askew.</p> <p>Action MF to highlight the issues of attendance and status of CPWG with Maxine and Stephen Askew.</p>	MF
<p>2 – Capital Programme 2010/11 10-08</p> <p>Capital FPR as at September was reviewed and discussed where further clarity was required on forecast outturn was required MB would follow this up</p>	
<p>3. Capital programme 2010/11 – 2014/15 10.09</p> <p>Capital programme moving forward was discussed. £8m capital programme. Some detail was discussed. Street Lighting – unlikely to spend anything in 2010/11 but still require full £1m budget. SU queried how investment strategy initiatives are shown – MB confirmed that there is no spend in capital budget allocated to initiatives and all capital receipts are currently in the pot for financing the general capital programme as opposed to funding specific investment initiatives. Availability of cash was discussed. AMP in progress – this may highlight strategic spend requirements – currently no budget provision. MB confirmed that this all highlighted the importance of the annual budget setting cycle where SM's should highlight their possible capital budget requirements moving forward so that where there are competing demands,</p>	

<p>they can be assessed and prioritised as opposed to a first come first serve basis. It was important that where requests for capital come forward on an ad hoc basis, proforma B's highlighted the issue of diminishing capital resources and the possibility of compromising future initiatives in the absence of a fully planned programme. DS highlighted fact the RTB receipts are now subject of pooling @ rate of 100% - an issue for future RTB forecasting as income will not be attributable to BDC.</p>	
<p>4. Governance report including project updates</p> <p>10.10</p> <p>Governance report highlighted those reports that were due and they were considered in turn.</p> <p><u>Post Project review – Thetford Market place</u> Some time since project complete and whilst less parking spaces, project still deemed to be a success.</p> <p><u>Post Project review - Elizabeth House</u> Retention sums still being held back re water issues. Lessons learned – need design consultation with users. Layout is an issue – CCTV required, toilets, access etc. Incident in reception has highlighted need to ensure procedures for raising alarm and attending are clearer. Need training on dealing with challenging people to be as wide as possible.</p> <p><u>Post project review - Victory park</u> Post project review focussed on the actual project objectives as opposed to focussing on financial issues and the “investment decision”. It has delivered land and infrastructure but unlikely to sell in 2010/11 and land is being parcelled for phased release</p> <p><u>Project Update – Asset Management System</u> Go Live proper will be in January 11 – training of users in hand.</p> <p><u>Release of Funding – Affordable Housing</u> The report detailed the reasons for request of release of funding – BDC 250k would unlock a much larger project drawing in significant investment. Release was agreed subject to blue form as Members were not present at meeting.</p> <p><u>Action</u> Complete blue form for release of 250k Affordable Housing budget</p> <p><u>Release of funding – Commercial property</u> Request was to draw down 2011/12 funding early to secure a tenant. This is not possible as 10/11 budget not yet approved. It was agreed that the most appropriate way to fund this would be to increase the 2010/11 probable which will be approved as part of budget setting process but as there is a time delay, fund from the commercial property reserve in the first instance and report if necessary via Governance report and once capital budget approved, ensure expenditure is correctly charged (recognising that if the budget is not approved, the expenditure will remain chargeable to the CP reserve)</p> <p><u>Action</u></p>	<p>MB/DS</p>

<p>MB to amend Capital budget to reflect the extra 70k required and expenditure to be charged to CP reserve in first instance</p>	<p>MB/RB</p>
<p>5. Funding 10.11 It was agreed this had been covered under section 3</p>	
<p>6. Matters arising from BISC 10.12 None</p>	
<p>7. Section 106 10.13 Group questioned why S106 came to CPWG. MF confirmed it ensured there was a regular update that detailed when receipts had to be spent by. DS confirmed this will become a much bigger issue that may need reviewing as S106 amounts increase.</p>	
<p>7. AOB 10.14 MS mentioned income generation activities falling under ED and it was agreed to discuss this after the meeting with MF and MB DS – John Room House – DS would provide an update at the next meeting RB – Play Areas – progressing and Zoe Footer is aiming to seek release of funding in 10/11</p>	
<p>Next meeting No date for the next meeting is agreed as it is dependent on conversations regarding the future of the group – as per min ref:10-07</p>	