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Reasoning behind the Policy:

AB Policy 3: South Spring Boroughs
Protect and enhance southern part of spring boroughs (Area 3) as a heritage gateway
A. A 'heritage gateway' will be created in the south of Spring Boroughs to give residents and visitors greater opportunities to benefit from heritage assets in the area.
The neighbourhood plan will encourage proposals which:

• protect heritage assets and enhance the setting of Northampton Castle and Mound, Grade 1 listed St Peters Church and Grade 11 listed Castle Hill United Reformed Church.
An objective of CAAP Policy 24 which we would like to reiterate in our own plan.
• create a heritage and green space
As announced by NBC & NCC (see Appendix 4)
• allow safe use of routes between Marefair and Chalk Lane by encouraging walking and cycling
• any housing provided will include a proportion of affordable family housing
The Executive Summary of the Heritage Gateway Report, published as background papers to the Council/Cabinet Decision:
Public Realm J7 - Chalk Lane terraces demolition and rebuild of new housing adjacent to Sol Central
If the terraces backing onto Castle Hill are demolished affordable family housing to replace those demolished would be sought and the tenants of those terraces decanted to the new properties.
[We would resist attempts to “Gentrify” Spring Boroughs]

• provide a children's play space
A Children's playground is proposed, and helps meet the identified need for children's playspace
• preserve the historic streets in Spring Boroughs
Previous “Regeneration” Projects have seen streets disappear, we would like to avoid this in any future Regeneration Projects.
The neighbourhood plan would support the creation of a Conservation Area, represented by Policy Area 3, to include the Saxon Palace site, St Peters Church, Hazelrigg House, Castle Mound and the site of Northampton Castle (to include the edge of the south bailey earthworks on Marefair and the finger of land stretching beyond Castle Mound to the Castle North Gate earthworks)
We support any steps that could be taken to promote and protect the heritage assets in this area.

Relationship to Central Area Action Plan:

The Policy in the CAAP regarding Protecting and enhancing heritage assets has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan, as it would be a major element of any future development in this area, there is also a “landmark” identified on the Proposals Map. Page 131 of the Central Area Action Plan defines a landmark as:

“Landmark - Points of reference that assist people in orientating themselves to an area, this could be a building, monument or open space”

We believe this would apply to any proposals that come forward and have chosen not to copy the “Landmark” sites onto the plan to reduce duplication, this is an approach we have taken wherever possible.
**Relationship to West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy:**

**The West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy**

12.86 Spring Boroughs lies within the area covered by the Northampton Central Area Action Plan (NCAAP). The policy direction within the JCS aims to support a comprehensive, community led approach for the area to address the levels of deprivation that currently exist. A **Neighbourhood Plan will set out in greater detail the community’s vision for regenerating the area.**

We believe the Neighbourhood Plan sets out an achievable vision whilst remaining aspirational, the County and Borough Councils have set an aspirational vision of creating an Urban Parkland (see Appendixes), this would fulfill the community’s desire for open/playspace, which along with all the other smaller improvements, most of which have been completed would improve the area significantly.

**Appendixes:**

1. NBC Cabinet Report 12th June 2013
   1.1. Appendix 1 of that Report
   1.2. Appendix 2 of that Report
2. MINUTES of the Business Meeting of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL held at County Hall, Northampton on 20 June 2013 at 10.30am
   (h) Northampton Heritage Gateway Feasibility Study: [see Appendix 1.1 & 1.2]
3. NCC Cabinet Report of 15 APRIL 2014
4. NCC - News - Proposals for Heritage Gateway revealed
CABINET REPORT

Report Title: Northampton 'Heritage Gateway' Feasibility Study and Options Appraisal

AGENDA STATUS: PUBLIC

Cabinet Meeting Date: 12 June 2013
Key Decision: Yes
Within Policy: N/A
Policy Document: N/A
Directorate: Regeneration, Enterprise & Planning
Accountable Cabinet Member: Cllr Tim Hadland
Ward(s): Castle & St Crispin

1. Purpose

1.1 The report outlines the concept of the ‘Heritage Gateway’ initiative and highlights the key findings of a recently commissioned study designed to consolidate a varied range of projects some of which are already underway in Northampton.

1.2 Cabinet are asked to endorse the outline proposals for the ‘Heritage Gateway’ note and the governance structure and the potential funding streams.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Endorse Section 3.3.1 of outline proposals for the ‘Heritage Gateway’ as set out in the report.

2.2 Receive regular progress reports on the implementation of the Heritage Gateway Project.
3. **Issues and Choices**

3.1 **Report Background**

3.1.1 Northampton Castle was built in the 11\textsuperscript{th} Century by Simon de Senlis in 1084 and the castle became one of the most important castles in England and was the centre of royal administration and of Royal parliaments for over 250 years. The castle was largely demolished in 1662 by orders of the King, the remainder being removed to accommodate the railway station in 1879. The only elements to remain were earth banks along St Andrews road and the repositioned ‘postern gate’ which forms part of the station entrance.

3.1.2 Surviving evidence of Northampton Castle includes the Victorian Postern Gate near to the railway station entrance and specifically the area referred to as Castle Hill which includes the former site of Castle Mound, The Great Hall and Queens Apartments, Castle Hill United Reform Church, Castle House, Chalk Lane and Doddridge car parks adjacent to Spring Boroughs ward. This area, owned mainly by the Borough Council, has become largely underused and a site of anti-social behaviour.

3.1.3 Adjacent to the Castle site is St Peters Church, one of the finest Norman churches in England and a contemporary of the Castle. Inside the Church great Norman arches of plain and banded stone rise and flow with zig-zag waves. They are supported by beautiful carved capitals, each overflowing with foliage, scrollwork, birds and beasts. Next to St Peters Church is St Peters Green which contains part of the buried remains of an Anglo-Saxon Palace or Minister that predates the Castle.

3.1.4 The ‘Heritage Gateway’ is, therefore, defined as the entrance to the town centre from the west including the new railway station, the Postern Gate, the Castle Hill area (as defined above), St Peters Church and Green, Black Lion Inn and along Marefair to include Hazelrigg House.

3.1.5 Although outside the ‘Heritage Gateway’ as currently envisaged, St Peters Waterside, University of Northampton’s Innovation Centre and Gold Street present further opportunities for heritage-based interpretation and public realm improvement works.

3.1.6 Similarly the opportunity exists to highlight and link the ‘Heritage Gateway’ offer with the development of the new Bus Interchange including The Drapery, Bridge Street, the Cultural Quarter and other potential heritage areas, like Eastgate.

3.2 **Issues**

3.2.1 There is a shared aspiration between the Partners (the Borough Council, Northamptonshire County Council, West Northamptonshire Development Corporation and the University of Northampton) and Stakeholders (Northamptonshire Enterprise Partnership, Friends of Northampton Castle and the Churches Conservation Trust) to ensure that the current development and
regeneration of the Northampton town centre is fully informed by, and reflects, the town’s unique heritage offer. Specifically, there are aspirations to develop a ‘Heritage Gateway’ to the town that recognises the important history surrounding the former Northampton Castle and other existing heritage assets in this area through a combination of physical and interpretive works.

3.2.2 A feasibility study and options appraisal has therefore been commissioned by the Partners to explore the potential around the site of the former castle, taking into account the existing heritage assets and wider development opportunities identified as a focus for celebration of the town’s past, and how the offer can be developed as a ‘heritage gateway’ to the town. The executive summary is attached at Appendix 1.

3.3 Choices (Options)

3.3.1 The Consultant’s report identifies a series of potential options which were drawn together following consultation with partner organisations, amenity groups and community groups. The options reflect the aspirations of the Partners and consultee’s and these were presented to the Partners and stakeholders at a workshop during which a preferred option was identified. The preferred option is specified at Appendix 2.

Immediate Outcomes (within current financial year: 2013/14)

- Railway Station – Re-naming (locally); Interpretation panels (internal & external); Window vinyls; Signage; Flagpoles; Touch / virtual model;
- Innovation Centre – Interpretation panels; Window vinyls; Signage (including greenways); Virtual model.

Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years: 2013/14 – 2014/15)

- Heritage Gateway’ – Signage; Interpretation panels; Heritage Trail;
- Landscaping and Landmark features Lower Marefair.

Medium-term Outcomes (3-5 years: 2013/14 – 2017/18)

- Castle House – Acquisition & demolition to form centrepiece of new urban parkland incorporating Castle Hill and former Chalk Lane and Doddridge car parks – see note 4.4 below;
- St Peters Church – Landscaping; Lighting; Events;
- St Peters Green - Saxon Palace/Minster landscaping & fencing;
- St Peters House acquisition, demolition & landscaping;
- Black Lion Inn – Repairs & refurbishment;
- Innovation Centre – Pavement poetry/sculpture;
- Castle Hill, Chalk Lane and Doddridge Car Parks – Viewing platform; landscaping, lighting & improved access; Touch / virtual model; Children’s themed playground within new wider landscaped urban parkland; Archaeological works & community digs; Enhanced trails & signage; Flagpoles & banners; Public artwork / sculpture; New social housing provision;
- Postern Gate – landscaping & lighting;
- Railway Station – High tech interpretation; Digital image projection; Pavement poetry & sculpture; Enhanced heritage trails and signage;
- Lower Marefair / Castle Hill – Traffic calming measures; Public realm works;
- Gold Street – shop / building heritage enhancement.

3.3.2 The implementations of the preferred mix of interventions are subject to the approval of the ‘Heritage Gateway’ Partners and Stakeholders, including Network Rail and London Midland specifically in relation to the Railway Station proposals.

3.3.3 A Strategic Project Board which includes senior officer representation from the County and Borough Councils and WNDC has been established to oversee the delivery of the ‘Heritage Gateway’ programme. Regular reports on the implementation of the Project will be brought to the respective Cabinets on a regular basis.

3.3.4 Cabinet have the option of endorsing the preferred option as selected by the working group which would strengthen support for the partnership approach which has been adopted or could choose to select an alternative set of preferred interventions based on the options identified in the Feasibility Options Appraisal and suggest these to the working group.

4. Implications (including financial implications)

4.1.1 Policy

4.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework will be relevant where consent is required for any of the proposed works. Works undertaken as part of the project will also need to accord with relevant policies of the Central Area Action Plan (CAAP) which was adopted on 16th January 2013. The Joint Core Strategy will also be relevant. There are a number of nationally published best practice guidance documents which will need to be taken into consideration.

4.1.2 Resources and Risk

4.2.1 A series of work packages have been proposed in outline to realise the ‘Heritage Gateway’ vision, each with a respective lead Partner or Stakeholder responsible for its delivery.

4.2.2 The total funding package required to deliver the preferred option is currently estimated at c. £8.5m inclusive of development costs over five years with an initial investment of c. £0.75m required in the current financial year to kick-start the project.

4.2.3 Funding for identified work packages would be secured by the Partners within an agreed Programme Framework from a range of sources.

4.2.4 Some of the funding can be found from S106 contributions. Moreover, it is expected that substantial bids to a variety of sources will be made by Partners and Stakeholders to the project. These include:
• Lottery (Arts Council; Heritage Lottery; BIG Lottery)
• Regional Growth Fund
• ERDF
• Trusts & Foundations

4.2.5 Detailed business cases on each proposition will be proposed and reported to Cabinet for consideration as and when required. An initial investment of c. £0.75m would be required in the current financial year 2013/14 to secure the immediate outcomes. Discussions are continuing on the sources of finance.

4.3 Legal

4.3.1 Legal implications. This will need to be discussed with Legal Services.

4.4 Equality

4.4.1 A full Equalities Impact Assessment will be required for a project of this scale and nature. The EIA will be scoped once the scale and nature of the proposals have been fully defined. The County Council has undertaken an initial Equalities Impact Assessment.

4.5 Consultees (Internal and External)

4.5.1 In addition to the Partners (NCC, NBC, WNDC) the following groups and organisations have been involved in the selection of the preferred option:

Northampton University
Churches Conservation Trust
Friends of Northampton Castle

Other key stakeholders in the project include Network Rail, London Midland and English Heritage.

4.6 How the Proposals deliver Priority Outcomes

4.6.1 The proposals for the Heritage Gateway align with Priority 3 Celebrating our Heritage & Culture as set out in the Corporate Plan.

4.7 Other Implications

4.7.1 None.

5. Background Papers

5.1 Northampton Heritage Gateway Feasibility & Options Appraisal March 2013

S Boyes,
Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning
0300 330 7000
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1.0 Executive Summary

This report investigates the options for developing Northampton’s Heritage Gateway. It has been commissioned and managed by Northamptonshire County Council, with support from key local partners including Northampton Borough Council, Northampton University, West Northampton Development Corporation, The Friends of Northampton Castle and The Churches Conservation Trust.

The purpose of this feasibility and options appraisal is to explore the potential around the site of the former Northampton Castle and the other heritage assets in this area. This will inform the development of a programme of works that can raise awareness of the importance of Northampton’s heritage, increase local pride in the area, draw people to and encourage them to stay in the area and create a lasting impression of the town as people arrive and leave on the train.

The report focuses on some key sites identified throughout the study. These key sites were classified as assets, potential assets or potential blockages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The key assets</th>
<th>The potential assets</th>
<th>The potential blockages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill/ Mound</td>
<td>Railway Station</td>
<td>St Peter’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Church</td>
<td>Postern Gate and area behind</td>
<td>Castle House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Green and the Saxon Palace</td>
<td>Chalk Lane Car Park</td>
<td>Railway Workers Social Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelrig House</td>
<td>Doddridge Car Park</td>
<td>Sol Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doddridge United Reform Church</td>
<td>Black Lion Pub</td>
<td>Electricity Substation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Lion Bus Stop</td>
<td>Western View Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Andrews/ Marefair Corner Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gold Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Stories to Tell

In addition to these key built features the wider history of the area was also considered to capture any themes that should be used to inform the Heritage Gateway interpretation, particularly in terms of the stories to tell. The key themes arising were:

- The castle is located where it is because of the Saxon town. There is a need to introduce people to the origins of the town and the important buildings lying under St Peter’s Green
- There is a need to explain that the story of medieval Northampton has largely been forgotten
- There is a need to tell stories about people and their lives rather than linear chronological development
- Initial stories about the castle should include a focus on what visitors are likely to know something of – so King John and Thomas a Becket stand out.
- The destruction of the castle (Civil War and Victorian) and its re-presentation (not least community involvement in this) present a story that people can really engage with.

The central issues are:

a) To define what stories to tell about it and the adjacent area; and
b) How to present those stories interpretively.

How to tell those stories comes next.

Any interpretive approach will be based around three key concepts:

- **Relate**: If people exploring the content cannot relate it to their own life experiences and interests, it will be sterile.
- **Provoke**: Interpretation is not about just giving information, it is about provoking people to think about what they are engaging with, and potentially encouraging their participation.
- **Reveal**: Clearly interpretation will always include information, but it is about revealing meanings by encouraging people to explore in more depth.
1.1 Methodology

Consultation was undertaken with a number of key stakeholders from within the partner organisations; for the local authorities this was done at both councillor and officer levels. The consultation highlighted the key needs for the various sites within the Heritage Gateway and allowed information about existing current plans, and potential future ideas for interventions to be collated. Examples of the types of interventions arising from the consultation included: improved signage, re landscaping of the castle mound, creating a heritage centre and better interpretation. A full list can be found in the main report.

This information, along with a review of the relevant policies and strategies for the area, and the previous experience of developing similar initiatives of Focus and Purcell, was used to score the importance of each of the various sites in terms of their potential contribution to the Heritage Gateway. In addition to this the various proposed interventions for the Heritage Gateway were categorised into the essential and desirable components.

From this information, a variety of costed options for the Gateway were developed, ranging from a very low impact option to a very high impact option. These differing options were used to inform a workshop session with representatives from key partner organisations and to gauge the level of commitment and appetite for change.

The culmination of this workshop was the creation of a rationalised option that took into account the risk, realism and deliverability of the different proposed interventions. This preferred mix of interventions has an estimated cost of **£8,182,500 + VAT**. The development stage budget required for this would be Circa £270,000. An overview of the funding to be spent in each of the various locations considered as part of the study is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Cost of the interventions at this location (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Railway Station</td>
<td>580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>162,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Innovation Centre</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>St Peter’s Church</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Saxon Palace</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Black Lion Pub</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Castle Hill Mound</td>
<td>840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Postern Gate</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Public Realm/Landscape/Greenway Interventions</td>
<td>3,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Black Lion Hill Bus Stop</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Hazelrigg House</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gold Street</td>
<td>675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Road Interchanges/Key Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,182,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interventions associated with this rationalised option were then categorised into immediate, short term and medium term actions and grouped into discrete, deliverable packages (none of the interventions were classified as long term). These different packages are shown on the maps over the following pages along more detailed cost information.

### 1.2 Immediate, Short Term and Medium Term Packages of Interventions

#### 1.2.1 Immediate Interventions – Total Cost £215,000

The different packages of interventions considered to be needed immediately are listed below and shown on the map over the page. The red interventions relate to works that are considered to be essential and the blue represents desired works. It is suggested that these interventions are delivered within the year.

**THE PACKAGES OF INTERVENTIONS AND ASSOCIATED COSTS FOR IMMEDIATE DELIVERY**

**Package 1 – Railway Station Essential (£100,000)**

- Railway Station A1- Interpretation panels internally detailing the history of Northampton - £10,000
- Railway Station A5 - Etching to windows of railway station building, possibly of the Castle- £20,000
- Railway Station A8 - Renaming to Northampton Castle Station - £0, already happening
- Railway Station A10 - Signage directing people to the key attractions in the Heritage Gateway and the rest of the town - £50,000
- Railway Station A11 - Interpretation panels externally detailing the history of Northampton - £20,000

**Package 1+ Railway Station Desired (£55,000)**

- Railway Station A6 - Touch model of the Castle showing where it was and what it would have looked like - £30,000
- Railway Station A14A - Marking out of the original Castle footprint using flagpoles - £25,000

**Package 2 – Innovation Centre Desired (£60,000)**

- Innovation Centre D2 - Interpretation panels internally, possibly focusing on historical Northampton innovators - £10,000
- Innovation Centre D3 - Etching to the windows of the innovation centre- £20,000
- Innovation Centre D4 - Signpost the greenways - £10,000
- Innovation Centre D6 - Virtual model of castle - £20,000.
The packages of interventions for immediate delivery

**Key**  
Red – Immediate Essential  
Blue – Immediate Desired
1.2.2 Short Term Interventions - £262,500 (in addition to the immediate)

The different packages of interventions considered by the working group to be needed in the short term are listed below and shown on the map (in green) along with the immediate interventions (red and blue). It is suggested that these interventions are delivered within 1-2 years.

The packages of interventions for short term delivery

Package 3 – Heritage Gateway Crucial £262,500

- Signage B1 - Signposting to the major heritage attractions and key nodes in the town - £35,000
- Signage B2 - Brown signage - £30,000
- Signage B4 - Interpretation panels externally detailing the history of the Heritage Gateway area and links to the rest of the town - £40,000
- Trails C1 - Trail leaflets - £7,500
- Public Realm J1 - Landscaping / remodeling of corner spot between Marefair and St Andrews - £50,000
- Bus Stop K1 - Create landmark - £100,000.
The packages of interventions for short term delivery

**Key**  Red – immediate essential  Blue – immediate desired  Green – Short term
1.2.3 Medium Term Interventions (in addition to the immediate and short term)

The medium term interventions have been split into the desired (shown on the map as purple) and the essential (shown on the map as pink) for ease of clarification. They can be seen on the map over the page and explained in more detail below. These should be delivered in addition to the immediate and short term interventions shown above.

a. Essential Medium Term Interventions - £1,970,000

The different packages of interventions considered to be needed in the medium term are listed below. It is suggested that these interventions are delivered within 3-5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The packages of interventions for medium term essential delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package 4 - Heritage Resource Centre (£630,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Black Lion G1/G2/G3 - External repairs/ refurbishment/ creation of a heritage centre £80,000 + £50,000 + £350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St Peter’s Church E1 - Public realm improvements £150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package 5 – Revealing Heritage (£1,340,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Saxon Palace F1- Landscaping of the grassed area £200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Saxon Palace F2 - Marking out the footprint of the building £75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Castle Mound H1- Improved access to the site £250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Castle Mound H2 - Landscaping of the mound £200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Castle Mound H3 - Castle model £30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Castle Mound H4 - Viewing platform £75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Castle Mound H6 - Marking out the castle remains on the surface £80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Castle Mound H7 - Improved lighting £100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Postern Gate I2 – Use as more of a heritage feature £30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Realm J2 - Chalk Lane car park remodeling £300,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Desirable Medium Term Interventions - £5,735,000

The different packages of interventions considered to be desired in the medium term are listed below. It is suggested that these interventions are delivered within 3-5 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package 4+ - Heritage Resource Centre Additional (645,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Church E4</td>
<td>Equipment to facilitate events and talks within the church</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm G4</td>
<td>St Peter’s House, acquisition, demolition and landscaping</td>
<td>£620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package 5+ - Revealing Heritage Additional (£3,610,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Palace F3B</td>
<td>Artistic fencing / boundary treatments around the perimeter of the green</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm J3</td>
<td>Create castle themed children’s playground</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm J4</td>
<td>Landscaping behind Postern Gate to highlight the location of the scheduled ancient monument</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm J5/J6</td>
<td>Castle House, acquisition, demolition and landscaping</td>
<td>£350,000 + £1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm J7</td>
<td>Chalk Lane terraces demolition and rebuild of new housing adjacent to Sol Central</td>
<td>£1,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Mound H5</td>
<td>Archaeological works with the local community</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Mound H6</td>
<td>Mosaic set in to the grass detailing the history/timeline</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Mound H9</td>
<td>Flagpoles and banners to mark out the layout of the castle</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postern Gate I1</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package 6 – Heritage Gateway Enhancements (£655,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station A7</td>
<td>High tech interpretation detailing the history of the town and other local attractions</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station A9</td>
<td>Image projections on the side of the railway station</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station A12</td>
<td>Pavement poetry e.g. etched into the paving</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station A13</td>
<td>Start of sculpture trail</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage B3</td>
<td>Sculpture based signage</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails C2</td>
<td>Pavement based guide ways</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails C3</td>
<td>Downloadable apps for trails</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails C4</td>
<td>Alan Moore trail</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails C5</td>
<td>Interacting gaming building on the history of the town, developed with local community youth groups</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails C6</td>
<td>Blue Badge trails</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Centre D5</td>
<td>Pavement Poetry etched in to the floor</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package 7 – Heritage Retail Concourse (£825,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads N1</td>
<td>Traffic calming pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Street M1</td>
<td>Highlight significant upper built environment with improved lighting</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Street M2</td>
<td>Grant scheme to improve shops</td>
<td>£600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The packages of interventions for medium term delivery

**Key**
- **Red** – Immediate essential
- **Blue** – Immediate desired
- **Green** – Short term
- **Purple** – Medium term desired
- **Pink** – Medium term essential
1.3 Delivery

1.3.1 Delivery Partners

The suggested delivery partner for each package is shown in the table below.
### 1.3.2 Delivery Plan

The proposed delivery plan for each package and for developing the action plan, interpretation strategy and the memorandum of understanding is shown below.

![Delivery Plan Diagram]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 1 - Railway Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 2 - Innovation Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 3 - Heritage Gateway Crucial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 4 - Heritage Resource Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 5 - Revealing Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 6 - Heritage Gateway Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package 7 - Heritage Retail Concours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Development/Funding Phase
- Delivery Phase/Construction

Immediate

Short Term

Long Term
### 1.3.3 Funding

The matrix below shows potential sources of funding that could be targeted to support the different elements of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Applicant/Lead</th>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Essential or Desired</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Heritage Lottery Fund</th>
<th>Heritage Enterprise (HLF)</th>
<th>THI</th>
<th>Our Heritage</th>
<th>Young Roots</th>
<th>ERDF/Regeneration Funds</th>
<th>ACE</th>
<th>Trusts and Foundations</th>
<th>Capital Receipt</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Package 1 Railway</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Package 1+ Railway</td>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>£55,000</td>
<td>£55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Package 2 Innovation Centre</td>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Package 3 Heritage Gateway</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>£262,500</td>
<td>£162,500</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£262,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches Conservation</td>
<td>Package 4 Heritage Resource Centre</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>£830,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£530,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches Conservation</td>
<td>Package 4+ Heritage Resource Centre</td>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>£645,000</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>£460,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Package 5 Revealing Heritage</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>£1,340,000</td>
<td>£240,000</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Package 5+ Revealing Heritage</td>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>£8,810,000</td>
<td>£910,000</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>Package 6 Heritage Gateway Enhancements</td>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>£655,000</td>
<td>£505,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County or Borough Council</td>
<td>Package 7 Heritage Retail Concourse</td>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£8,182,500</td>
<td>£2,417,500</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
<td>£990,000</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£1,700,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>£8,182,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percentage Contribution % | 29.54 | 24.44 | 12.13 | 6.11 | 1.22 | 0.61 | 20.76 | 1.22 | 1.53 | 2.44 | 100.00 |
1.3.4 Programme Management

The information below highlights the suggested programme management structure for the project.

**STRATEGIC BOARD – KEY DECISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ciaburro</td>
<td>County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Boyes</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Garden</td>
<td>West Northants Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Petford</td>
<td>University of Northampton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELIVERY / PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS**

*Including Approximate Resources Required*

- Graham Callister (County Council) 2 Days a week
- Duncan Harper (WNDC) 1 Day a week
- Susan Badcock (University) 2 Hours a week
- TBC (Borough Council) 1 Day a week
- Peter Aiers (Churches Conservation Trust) 1 Day a week
- Marie Dickie (Friends of Northampton Castle) 1/2 Day a week

**PROJECT SUPPORT TEAM**

- Focus Consultants
- Purcell Architects
- Graham Black Interpretations.
1.3.5 Key Risks and Issues Identified

All of the information outlined above must be considered along with the potential risks and issues highlighted throughout the process. These are listed below.

1. Partners commitment / ambition
   - Effective partnership working
2. Partners responsibilities
   - Capital
   - Sustainable management and maintenance
   - Continued renewal / investment strategy
3. Changing political climate
4. Potential to miss opportunity
5. Intellectual integrity
   - Heritage Gateway and the wider Northampton offer
6. Engaging the public
7. Securing funding
8. Legal issues
9. Securing strategic stakeholders support
10. Overall management and co-ordination.
1.4 The Next Steps

The next steps required to get this project underway will be for the partners to give initial funding approval for:

- **Action Plan**: £30,000
- **Interpretation Strategy**: £30,000
- **Memorandum of Understanding**: £10,000
- **Development Costs**: £200,000 (circa)
- **Immediate Works**: £215,000
- **Short Term Works**: £262,500
- **Contingency Provision**: £52,500

**Total**: £800,000 + VAT
Heritage Gateway Feasibility Study & Options Appraisal
– Location

KEY:
- primary distribution nodes
- primary route
- secondary route (cycles)
- unused railway greenway
- city areas as labelled
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Heritage Gateway – Options Overview

Option 1
Do Nothing

Option 2
Very Low Impact
£752,500

Option 3
Low Impact
£1,087,500

Option 4
Medium Impact
£2,667,500

Option 5
High Impact
£4,752,500

Option 6
Very High Impact
£9,967,500

Cost Notes:
- Budget Cost
- At Current Rates
- Includes Fees
- Excludes VAT
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Preferred Option & Mix of Interventions

PREFERRED OPTION & MIX OF INTERVENTIONS

£8,182,500 + VAT

Development Stage Budget Required Circa £270,000
To Develop All Interventions
Northampton Heritage Gateway
- Immediate Outcomes (within a year)

**ESSENTIAL**

Railway Station - A1
Interpretation panels
£10,000

Railway Station - A5
Etching to windows
£20,000

Railway Station - A8
Rename station
£0, done

Railway Station - A10 & Signage
£50,000

**DESERVED**

Railway Station - A6
Touch model castle
£30,000

Railway Station - A14A
Marking out castle footprint
£25,000

Innovation Centre - D2
Interpretation panels, internally
£10,000

Innovation Centre - D3
Etching
£10,000

Innovation Centre - D4
Signpost greenways
£10,000

Innovation Centre - D6
Virtual model of castle
£20,000

**CAPITAL COSTS**

Immediate Essential
- Package 1 Railway Station £100,000
- Package 1 Railway Station + £55,000 (making £155,000 overall)
- Package 2 Innovation Centre £60,000

Total Immediate £215,000

Key
Essential – Red
Desired - Blue
Northampton Heritage Gateway
- Short Term Outcomes (1 – 2 Years)  Essential Green

In addition to Immediate Interventions

**ESSENTIAL**

Signage B1,
Signposting, key nodes
£35,000

Signage -B2 Brown signage £30,000

Signage B4, interpretation panels, externally £40,000

Trails - C1 trail leaflets £7500

Public Realm - J1 Landscaping of corner spot £50,000

Bus Stop - K1 Create landmark £100,000

**CAPITAL COSTS**

Immediate
Short Term Essential £215,000
- Package 3 Heritage Gateway Crucial £262,500

Total Short Term £477,500
Northampton Heritage Gateway
- Medium Term Outcomes (3-5 Years)

In addition to Immediate and Short Term Interventions

ESSENTIAL

Saxon Palace - F1 Landscaping
£200,000

Saxon Palace - F2 Marking out the building
£75,000

Black Lion - G1/G2
External repairs/refurbishment
G3 Heritage Centre
£80,000 + £50,000 + £350,000

Castle Mound - H2 Landscaping mound
£200,000

St Peters Church – E1
Public Realm
£150,000

Castle Mound - H1 Improved access
£250,000

Castle Mound - H7
Improved lighting
£100,000

Postern Gate I2 Heritage Feature
£30,000

Public Realm - J2 Chalk Lane car park remodelling
£300,000

Castle Mound - H6
Marking out the palace footprint/caste remains
£80,000

Castle Mound - H4
Viewing platform
£75,000

Castle Mound - H3
Castle Model
£30,000
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Northampton Heritage Gateway
- Medium Term Outcomes (3-5 Years) Desired (if achievable)

In addition to Immediate, Short Term and Medium Term Essential

**DESIRED**

- **Railway Station - A7** High tech interpretation
  - £150,000
- **Railway Station - A9** Image projections
  - £150,000
- **Railway Station - A12** Pavement poetry
  - £25,000
- **Railway Station - A13** Start of sculpture trail
  - £100,000
- **Signage - B3** Sculpture based signage
  - £50,000
- **Trails - C2** Pavement based guide ways
  - £10,000
- **Trails - C3** Downloadable apps for trails
  - £80,000
- **Public Realm - J3** Create children’s playground
  - £400,000
- **Castle Mound - H5** Archaeological works
  - £50,000
- **Gold Street - M1/M2** Highlight significant upper built environment/ grant scheme to improve
  - £75,000 + £600,000
- **H9 Flagpoles and banners**
  - £25,000
- **Postern Gate - I1** Improved lighting
  - £15,000

**PUBLIC REALM - J4** landscaping behind Postern Gate
- £150,000
- J5/J6 Castle House
- £350,000
- J7 Terraces Demolition
- £1,390,000
- **Innovation Centre – D5** Pavement Poetry
  - £25,000
- **St Peters Church - E4** Events, talks and equipment
  - £25,000
- **Saxon Palace - F3B** Artistic fencing
  - £100,000
- **Castle Mound - H8** Mosaic
  - £30,000
- **H9 Flagpoles and banners**
  - £25,000
- **Postern Gate**
  - £150,000
- **Roads - N1** Traffic calming pedestrian crossing
  - £150,000

**CAPITAL COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term Essential Package 4 Heritage Resource Centre</th>
<th>Medium Term Essential Package 5 Revealing Heritage</th>
<th>Medium Term Desired Package 4 + Package 5 + Package 6 Heritage Gateway Enhancements + Package 7 Heritage Retail Concourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£262,500</td>
<td>£630,000</td>
<td>£1,340,000</td>
<td>£1,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,970,000</td>
<td>£1,340,000</td>
<td>£1,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£8,182,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>£8,182,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Focus Consultants 2010 LLP
MINUTES of the Business Meeting of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
held at County Hall, Northampton on 20 June 2013 at 10.30am

PRESENT:
Councillor Joan Kirkbride (Chairman)

Councillor Sally Beardsworth  Councillor Derek Lawson MBE
“ Paul Bell “ Stephen Legg
“ Catherine Boardman “ Arthur McCutcheon
“ Wendy Brackenbury “ John McGhee
“ Michael Brown “ David Mackintosh
“ Robin Brown “ Allan Matthews
“ Mary Butcher “ Andy Mercer
“ Adam Collyer “ Dennis Meredith
“ Elizabeth Coombe “ Ian Morris
“ Gareth Eales “ Steve Osborne
“ Brendan Glynane “ Bill Parker
“ André Gonzalez De Savage “ Suresh Patel
“ Christopher Groome “ Russell Roberts
“ James Hakewill “ Bob Scott
“ Eileen Hales MBE “ Mick Scrimshaw
“ Jim Harker OBE “ Judy Shephard
“ Stan Heggs “ Steve Slatter
“ Alan Hills “ Heather Smith
“ Sue Homer “ Danielle Stone
“ Jill Hope “ Winston Strachan
“ Dudley Hughes “ Michael Tye
“ Sylvia Hughes “ Sarah Uldall
“ Phil Larrett “ Allen Walker
“ Graham Lawman “ Malcolm Waters

Also in attendance (for all or part of the meeting):
Dr Akeem Ali – Director of Public Health & Wellbeing
Paul Blantern, Chief Executive
Matt Bowmer, LGSS Director of Finance
Art Conaghan – Conservative Group Political Assistant
Martyn Emberson, Chief Fire Officer
Laurie Gould, Monitoring Officer
Kirk Harrison, Democracy Officer
Alex Hopkins, Director of Customers, Communities & Learning
Carolyn Kus, Director of Adult Social Care Services
Jenny Rendall, Democracy Officer (Minutes)

And 4 members of the public.
36/13 Apologies for non-attendance:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Julie Brookfield, Jim Broomfield, Michael Clarke, Matt Golby, Mike Hallam, Chris Lofts & Bob Patel,

37/13 To approve and sign the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on Thursday 16 May 2013:

RESOLVED that: Council approved the minutes of the Council meeting held on Thursday 16 May 2013 subject to the following amendments:

- The inclusion of Councillor Eileen Hales’ MBE.
- Item 33/13, (a), (ii): that Councillor Judy Shephard be noted as Chairman of the Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee and Councillor James Hakewill be noted as Chairman of the Finance & Resources Scrutiny Committee.

38/13 Notification of requests by members of the public to address the meeting

There were none.

39/13 Declarations of Interest by Councillors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (e)</td>
<td>Sally Beardsworth</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Member of Adoption Panel A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40/13 Chairman’s Announcements:

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- The sad death of Councillor Ken Melling the previous day. He had represented the Middleton Cheney Division from 2005 taking an active role on both the Personnel and Audit Committees. During 2009-10 he did a sterling job as Chairman of the Pensions Committee bringing his business experience and acumen to the role. He was also a great champion for the people he represented and alongside David Cameron was instrumental in keeping the maternity ward open in Horton Hospital which was used by many of his constituents. He had recently been elected Vice-Chairman of the County Council and would be a great loss to the county. He was also a great friend to the Chairman who felt the loss of being unable to work with him in the Council Chamber. Condolences were sent to his wife, Jane and family.

Council then observed a minute’s silence in memory of Councillor Ken Melling.

- Congratulations were sent to the Chief Fire Officer who had been awarded the Queen’s Fire Service Medal in her Majesty’s Birthday Honours List. He won the award for leading the county’s Fire & Rescue Service and this award which was the highest that could be offered to a firefighter was recommended by ministers in the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Under the Chief Fire Officer’s command the Northamptonshire Fire & Rescue Service (NFRS) had become one of the leading and most innovative services in the country. He had travelled the country demonstrating how the new Cobra firefighting method tackled fires in a more efficient and friendly way. It had achieved
international interest and those adopting the system implemented in Northamptonshire included local authorities in Greater Manchester and Kent as well as Singapore, Belgium and France.

Partnership work within the county had also been extended further. The co-responding scheme with the East Midlands Ambulance Service meant firefighters who were first on a scene could assist those with injuries whilst waiting for an ambulance to arrive.

Through the co-responding scheme firefighters were trained to administer first aid at incidents where they were the first attending service at an accident. The NFRS had attended over 1,300 incidents the previous year using cutting edge equipment and firefighting methods under the Chief Fire Officer’s command.

- The remaining sum from the previous year’s empowering councillors fund had been donated to provide book tokens for the county’s looked after children (LAC). Waterstones had kindly opened up on one of their stores one evening to enable the LAC to spend their tokens. The Chairman would be e-mailing councillors during the year requesting suggestions as to how this could be continued.

- Mohammad, a LAC living in Welford House was congratulated on his dedication to wrestling through attendance at the Slough Free Wrestling Club in Buckinghamshire. This dedication had enabled him to regularly take part in competitions around the country and he had recently successfully beaten the current world champion from a visiting French team in an inter-club competition. Mohammed’s support workers were also thanked for their encouragement and support and he was wished well in future endeavours.

- Various local leaders had signed the Community Covenant earlier that week. This was a way by which local authorities could ensure soldiers were assisted when they returned to civilian life. Local authorities were ideally placed to provide this assistance as they were responsible for various areas such as housing.

- Councillors were reminded that they would shortly receive invitations to the Chairman’s Garden Party which would be held on Sunday 21 July 2013 at Grendon Hall. Talented musicians from the Northamptonshire Music & Performing Arts Service would be providing entertainment and children were welcome.

- Councillors had also received an invitation to a garden party being hosted by the High Sheriff at his home on Sunday 28 July 2013 in aid of the Nene Valley Care Trust.

**41/13 Petitions:**

There were none.

**42/13 Business Items (including annual reports, budget & policy framework items & appointments):**

(a) Appointment of the Independent Chairman of the Audit Committee:

At the Chairman’s invitation Councillor Bill Parker proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating the appointment had been extended the previous year. Now that the implications of the Local Audit & Accountability Bill were known it was
felt the re-appointment of the current Independent Chairman, Mr David Watson would bring stability to the Audit Committee as well as retain the expertise he brought to the role.

The report was seconded by Councillor Allen Walker who referred to the trustworthiness of the current Independent Chairman as well as his knowledge of the Council and how it operated.

RESOLVED that: Council agreed to extend the term of the current Independent Chairman of the Audit Committee until 30 November 2017.

(b) Annual Review of the Constitution (including appointments to Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee):

At the Chairman’s invitation Councillor Heather Smith proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating the changes related to the Contract Procedure Rules and the Overview & Scrutiny Function of Council, details of which were in Section 5 of the report. It was proposed the post of Scrutiny Champion be deleted and the Chairmen of the scrutiny committees take a leading role in their areas of scrutiny with one of them appointed to Chair the Scrutiny Management Committee. The Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee wished to appoint voting members from borough and district councils but under the Health & Social Care Act 2012, these had to be approved by Council.

The report was seconded by Councillor Judy Shephard who referred to the Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee’s wish to continue to welcome borough and district council members with full voting rights. It was felt this had been effective in the past.

Councillors also noted the Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee’s responsibilities had and would continue to increase, particularly as major changes were expected to be proposed in health services during the next 12-24 months. Assistance from borough and district council colleagues would therefore be much appreciated.

RESOLVED that: Council:

1) Noted the Monitoring Officer’s annual review of the Constitution;
2) Agreed the constitutional changes as set out in Section 5 to the report;
3) Agreed that these changes take effect from 21 June 2013 unless otherwise stated; and
4) Agreed that the Monitoring Officer be delegated responsibility to make these amendments and any associated conforming amendments and republish the Constitution.

(c) Report by the Independent Panel for Councillors’ Allowances

At the Chairman’s invitation Councillor Allen Walker proposed the report and an amendment (copies of which had been previously circulated) highlighting details of the amendment as follows:

- The deletion of 2 cabinet posts and creation of 4 Assistant Cabinet positions with an allowance of £5,000 per annum.
- To reflect the greater workload of the Leader of the Major Opposition, an allowance of £8,000 per annum.
- To reflect the demanding role of scrutiny chairmen, an annual allowance of £11,000.
- An allowance of £2,000 per annum to the Deputy Chairman of the Development Control Committee.
To reflect the demands and time consuming role of the Chairmen of both the Personnel Committee and Pension Fund Board, an annual allowance of £10,000.

The Group Business Manager of the Administration to receive an allowance of £10,000 per annum.

The report and amendment was seconded by Councillor Eileen Hales.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised that those serving on the Fostering and Adoption Panels should not receive an allowance.
- Concerns were also raised that the proposal to allocate 3 places on the Fostering and Adoption Panels to the Administration and 1 to the Major Opposition would result in the loss of valuable experience and expertise.
- Concerns were raised that allowances should not be raised during the current economic climate.
- Some queried some raises and requested further details of the reasons for them.
- It was noted that the general public who were unaware of all the responsibilities of their councillors could view raising some special responsibility allowances badly, particularly those on fixed incomes.
- It was also noted the review had been undertaken based on the fact that a smaller council required members to take on more responsibility.
- It was noted the proposed new member of the Adoption Panel from the Major Opposition had a wealth of experience both within and externally to the Council.
- The proposed scheme would result in a saving of £7,000 per annum.
- Some felt that given the new smaller council, this was the best time to undertake a review, especially if it set a scheme for the new few years.

In response Councillor Walker referred to the recent elections which could have resulted in 57 councillors all new to the role. He noted that as the basic allowance had been reviewed earlier that year, this review had only considered special responsibility allowances based on additional work required as a consequence of a smaller council. The Independent Panel for Councillors’ Allowances had followed traditional job evaluation methodologies and recognised that some of these roles were as onerous as a part-time and in some cases, full-time job.

Upon the vote, the amendment was accepted.

Upon a further vote, the motion, as amended was accepted.

RESOLVED that: Council:

1) Noted the report on members’ allowances prepared by the Independent Panel for Councillors’ Allowances and recommendations within it;

2) Approved the recommendations and amendments to the report as follows:
   - That Assistant Cabinet Members be awarded an allowance of £5,000 per annum;
   - That Overview & Scrutiny Vice-Chairmen be awarded an allowance of £2,000 per annum;
   - That the Deputy Leader of the Principal Opposition be awarded an allowance of £8,000 per annum;
   - That 4 members be appointed to the Fostering & Adoption Panel, 3 being from the Administration and 1 from the Major Opposition;
   - That members of the Fostering & Adoption Panel be awarded an allowance of £4,000 per annum;
• That the Chairman of the Development Control Committee be awarded an allowance of £11,000 per annum;
• That the Deputy Chairman of the Development Control Committee be awarded an allowance of £2,000 per annum;
• That the Chairmen of the Personnel Committee and Pension Fund Board be awarded an allowance of £10,000 per annum; and
• The Group Business Manager of the Administration be awarded an allowance of £10,000 per annum.

3) That the allowances be backdated to 16 May 2013; and
4) Authorised the Monitoring Officer to implement the new scheme.

(d) Appointment of Representatives to Outside Bodies:

At the Chairman’s invitation, Councillor Allen Walker proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) highlighting the following alterations to Appendix 1 to the report:

• That Councillor Bob Scott be appointed as the third member on the Corby Youth & Community Centre.
• That Councillor Eileen Hales be appointed to the Crescents Community Association.
• That Councillor Eileen Hales be appointed to the East Kettering Liaison Forum
• That Councillor Graham Lawman be the second appointee to LANRAC.
• That Councillor Heather Smith be appointed to the Northamptonshire Records Office – Technical & Advisory Panel.
• That Councillor Robin Brown be appointed to APSE.
• That Councillor Winston Strachan be appointed to the Anglian Regional Flood Defence Committee (Northern).
• That no representation was required to the Kettering Welfare Rights Advice Service as this organisation had ceased.

In proposing the report, Councillor Walker gave thanks to officers who had assisted him in his new role of Group Business Manager to appoint members from his group to the various organisations Council supported. He noted the above amendments and confirmed he could discuss any further amendments following the meeting.

The report was seconded by Councillor Michael Tye who referred to the work undertaken by officers in Democratic Services during the past year to review which organisations were supported and why. Those on the list were those Council had felt most deserved support and he asked that those appointed attend as many meetings as possible, particularly as many of the organisations met quarterly or less infrequently.

Councillors commented as follows:
• A request was made that Councillor Bob Scott be appointed to APSE as a representative of the major opposition. It was also clarified the representative from the Administration was Councillor Robin Brown.
• It was noted the Becketts & Sargeants Educational Foundation served the whole of the Borough of Northampton.

In reply Councillor Walker confirmed the appointments would be checked and confirmed. He was also happy to discuss the second appointment to APSE with the Labour Group Business Manager following the meeting.
RESOLVED that: Council appointed representatives to the organisations as set out in Appendix 1 to the report and as amended during the meeting.

(e) Annual Report by the Corporate Parenting Board:

The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Board, Councillor Joan Kirkbride proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) referring to the Corporate Parenting Strategy (Appendix 1 to the report) which detailed how the Council intended to improve services for looked after children through a comprehensive action plan based on the 5 outcomes of the Every Child Matters agenda. She also requested that councillors, as corporate parents, considered the needs of looked after children as they would their own.

The report was seconded by Councillor Catherine Boardman who confirmed the Corporate Parenting Strategy would be available on the Council’s website. She referred to the priority outcomes which formed the strategy framework followed by the Council and partner agencies when acting in the interests of all young people in their care including those leaving care who were still entitled to receive support. She felt that corporate parents should act as ‘pushy’ parents when assisting these young people to grow and achieve in their lives.

Councillors commented as follows:

- The Strategy was commended for the contribution looked after children had made to it.
- Concerns were raised that the terminology used in this and other Council strategies and policies could be improved. For instance an annual stock take suggested to some cattle rather than children.
- It was suggested councillors visit the schools in their divisions, regardless of whether they were also a governor to ensure the needs of the looked after children in these schools were addressed.
- Concerns were raised that personal advisors should meet with young people leaving care more frequently than every 6 months. A lot could happen in 6 months and for some young people their personal advisor could be their only confidante.
- It was noted looked after children were very informative and usually willing to discuss general issues with councillors. It was therefore suggested meeting with looked after children on a regular basis would enable the strategy to become fully embedded within the system.
- It was felt that the recent changes in the Corporate Parenting Board and senior officers would ensure future improvements.
- It was noted children whilst often well cared for in school, often had nothing outside of school. This could lead to boredom which could then affect their learning. Learning did not just take place within school and it was necessary to ensure looked after children could travel to and from external activities which would assist them to integrate with communities.

In response the following was confirmed:

- The annual stock take was not a stock take of children but a new ministerial guide used by Central Government to ensure the outcomes of the Every Child Matters agenda were followed.
- Comments relating to the frequency of visits to children leaving care by personal advisors would be considered.
- One of the aims of the Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Board was to ensure greater contact with looked after children.
Transport issues were regularly reviewed and the Council would make every effort to resolve them wherever possible.


(f) Annual Report by the Health & Wellbeing Board:

At the Chairman’s invitation, Councillor Robin Brown proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) highlighting the following:

- Reference was made to recent media coverage regarding targets in the health service for addressing issues such as obesity, particularly in children.
- The 5 main priorities for delivering change would only be successful should all of the partners on the Board work together as well as individually to meet the targets.
- It was now more important than ever to use funding effectively. Whilst there was restricted funding for basic services, there would also be funding available to undertake partnership work. The Board however, would not use its funding to solve a problem or shortage in another partner’s budget but aimed to use it to attract funding of up to 3 times the value. This was only possible by aggressively promoting the priorities in the strategy.
- The recent consultation had received 383 responses, a large number of which were representatives of other organisations.
- The Board’s future was considered to be stable with a good strategy and he welcomed the Council’s Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee’s scrutiny of its work.

The report was seconded by Councillor Suresh Patel who stated he felt integration of services was a key responsibility of the Board. He was keen to support this in his capacity as Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and encourage borough and district councils to assist in ensuring more robust outcomes for the people of Northamptonshire. Issues to consider were an increasing ageing population and increased numbers of people with acute health needs. There was a need to act now rather than later when the needs would be most expensive and complex.

In answer to queries on the report the following was stated:

- The Board would play a significant role in assisting local Accident & Emergency Departments to address issues, although the Clinical Commissioning Groups were responsible for recognising issues in the first instance.
- The ‘silo mentality’ of many organisations involved in health was recognised by central and local government.
- Future consultation would be arranged via Healthwatch Northamptonshire which had responsibility for public and patient involved. The forthcoming Northamptonshire analysis would also provide a better understanding of how to manage the available budget.
- Although the strategies were aspirational it was also felt they could be achieved.
- With regard to Early Years, there was a need to ensure the basics were adequately provided.
- Services provided would be aimed at giving individuals choice and control.
- The commissioners of services were responsible for ensuring those services were delivered but partners would need to work together to achieve improvements.
- The Nene Clinical Commissioning Group had not put forward a proposal to close Favell House. However, the consultation on how to provide the type of care it provided should ensure it was provided for the benefit of all residents in the county.
There were 9 females on the Board which consisted of those best able to undertake the role, regardless of gender.

Mental Health was represented on the Board via the expert knowledge of Dr David Smart who was a leading mental health specialist in the country.

Councillors also commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised that the strategy was not as well balanced as it could be. Parents and not the State for instance were responsible for their children’s health and new mothers should not be forced into breastfeeding babies but encouraged.
- The Health, Adult Care and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee would regularly scrutinise the work of the Board.
- Some felt there was a need to ensure the services required by the elderly were provided.
- It was suggested the strategy did not adequately explain the role of GP Services which were much more important than they had been in the past. It was also noted the Out-of-Hours Services provided by local GPs had created a pressure on A&E Departments as the role of the GP had changed from that of a local family doctor who knew families and people where they lived and worked.
- Concerns were raised that the strategy missed some vital areas such as street workers who supported those with alcohol issues. Greater emphasis it was felt could also be given to mental health services.
- Concerns were also raised that the strategy did not recognise the role children’s centres had in promoting family values. In recent years the children’s centres had supported teenage mothers as the health service ceased to fund this area of work.
- It was suggested the virtues of swimming for the health and wellbeing of all ages could be promoted.
- The strategy was commended for the way in which it would bring all partners together in a common aim of providing preventative services which would assist in reducing the issues that caused people to present at hospital in later life.

**RESOLVED that:** Council:

1) Agreed to continue to support the Health & Wellbeing Board as it took on its role as a statutory body;
2) Noted the Health & Wellbeing Board’s Annual Report; and
3) Endorsed the Health & Wellbeing Strategy.

**(g) Treasury Management Report, Outturn 2012-13:**

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Bill Parker proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating it had been presented to Cabinet the previous week who had recommended it to Council.

The report was seconded by Councillor Graham Lawman.

In answer to a query on the report Councillor Parker stated the report and treasury management were very carefully linked to the Council's capital programme. The Capital Strategy would be revised shortly, particularly as there were a number of budget pressures which required careful management of finances.

**RESOLVED that:** Council noted the Treasury Management Report, Outturn 2012-13.
(h) Northampton Heritage Gateway Feasibility Study:

At the Chairman’s invitation, Councillor Andre Gonzalez de Savage proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) highlighting the Council’s pride in the county’s heritage and culture. The report also included full details of the strategy and stakeholder event held prior to the drawing of the plans.

The report was seconded by Councillor David Mackintosh who confirmed Northampton Borough Council had supported the study at its cabinet meeting the previous week. He felt this was an exciting time to look to the future and consider errors of the past such as the destruction of the castle and noted the interest by local people in the recent excavations of the castle.

Councillors commented as follows:

- The report was commended as excellent which would be welcomed by all residents in the county as well as Northampton. The Council’s lead in regenerating historic sites within Northampton was welcomed.
- Some felt funding used to celebrate parts of the county’s heritage that no longer existed could be better used to benefit the people of the county.
- Some welcomed the study’s explanation of the county’s heritage before it disappeared. It was felt the complexity of the geographical situation of the castle had been under-estimated as it had played an important part in the country’s history. Lessons could be learned from events such as the persecution of Jews in the 12th century.
- It was suggested other historic sites around the county could be excavated and explained in the same way as the Northampton Castle site.
- Concerns were raised that the heritage gateway lead to a town centre that was in a poor state and the funding could be better spent improving the town centre and ensuring it was a place people wished to visit.
- It was felt more could have been made of Northampton’s connections through history such as the Treaty of Northampton in 1290 which promised Scotland would be without subjugation, Richard II, the Battle of Northampton and the people of Northampton who took part in the Battle of Towton under the banner of the wild rat.
- It was noted the area of Northampton most affected by the heritage gateway was one of the most disadvantaged areas of the county and involving the residents of this area would stimulate pride and cause them to take ownership in it.
- Concerns were raised that unless the budget was monitored closely, costs would increase.
- The project was considered to be an important one for the county. It was important to exploit the whole area around the former Castle site which included a medieval inn and church. Its heritage was Northampton’s unique ‘selling point’ which competitors such as Milton Keynes did not have.
- Northamptonshire remained the fastest growing county in the country with good transport links and the study’s aim of encouraging people to become involved in its heritage and lay roots of their own was commended.

In reply Councillor Gonzalez de Savage stated Council would encourage investment by private operators through business. Engagement with the public would continue particularly with residents of Spring Boroughs in which the Gateway area was sited. Northampton had many benefits such as the Enterprise Zone and the University’s planned move back to the town centre. He confirmed funding would be brought into Northampton not just from other parts of the country but Europe. He also confirmed the budget would be carefully monitored.
RESOLVED that: Council:

1) Approved the outline proposal for the Heritage Gateway as set out in Section 4 of the report;
2) Approved the proposed governance structure for the ‘Heritage Gateway’ project as set out in section 4 of the report;
3) Agreed the way forward as set out in section 5 of the report;
4) To include the Heritage Gateway Project in the Council’s Capital Strategy Development Pool of capital schemes to enable further development of the scheme through the agreed Council capital governance arrangements;
5) To proceed with the initial investment works of £750K subject to the funding being in place; and
6) Agreed that the Director of Environment, Development and Transport and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance can enter into negotiations over the possible purchase of Castle House and agree any contractual requirements associated with the possible purchase.

(Councillor Elizabeth Coombe left the meeting at 12.35pm)

43/13 Opposition Priority Business:

At the Chairman’s invitation, Councillor Bob Scott proposed the following motion:

“This Council believes the recent changes to the bus services in this county have resulted in many, many of our constituents experiencing great difficulties in being able to travel to suit their needs. Those most affected are the elderly and parents.

In the case of the elderly, the main areas of complaint tend to be about the withdrawal of a service which means that they have to walk further to the bus stop and those who have physical problems either suffer or don’t attempt the journey.

In the case of parents there is the problem of keeping children under control whilst walking to the bus stop.

Common to both groups tends to be the cost element of alternative transport.

Council wishes to set up a cross-party group to collate the complaints and to seek to mitigate the problems experienced by engaging with the bus company in question.”

In proposing the motion, Councillor Scott stated that during the recent elections, many constituents had complained about the loss of many services. Bus operators stated this had happened following a review of routes, some of which were funded by Section 106 funding which had now ceased. Many of the complaints came from the elderly living in sheltered or semi-sheltered accommodation. His own division of Lloyds included 2 areas with over 100 such homes and many residents required aids to walking. Changes to the X1 service required them to walk further to their nearest bus stop across a busy road. For many this was too far and they either had to fund a cab from their limited pensions or stay at home. Many opted to stay at home as their limited funding was affected by a lack of access to a work based pension during their working life. Parents struggled with prams as well as in keeping control of their children whilst walking the additional distance across the busy road. The bus operator did not take account of the needs of these people when changing the routes and when asked, they claimed there would be no further changes. The people of Corby were not the only residents to suffer from such changes.
The motion was seconded by Councillor Winston Strachan who stated residents across the county had suffered similarly. Some had only received a leaflet stating the service would change without consultation.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Reference was made to residents who no longer had no direct access to their nearest shopping area because of a change in bus routes which caused them to use a bus service to one area and then change to another service to travel to the same area. It was suggested this ultimately cost the Council more money as well as impact on the environment.
- Some felt the Council had a moral obligation to ensure private bus operators provided adequate services and considered the needs of bus users above profit.
- Examples were given where local leaders and residents had lobbied bus operators to provide improved services that served particular areas. Officers from the Council had assisted in the area of Kettering to secure improved services to Kettering, Bedford and Rushden. It was suggested seeking to address locals on a local basis could achieve greater results, particularly as a countywide approach would not necessarily ensure a full understanding of local needs.
- It was noted Section 106 funding was aimed at starting a new service in a new development for which custom would grow until the operator had a viable service. The operator would withdraw any service that was not viable following the cessation of the Section 106 funding.
- Bus operators were paid for concessionary bus journeys at a contract rate. Many of those using a concessionary pass could fund the journey and again, should there be few paying clients, the service would become unviable and be withdrawn.
- Some voluntary bus services could assist those in areas where they had lost a local route. For instance the Northampton Door to Door Service would take bus passes but it was a service that had to be booked.
- It was suggested this issue could be considered by a working group of the Environment, Growth & Transport Scrutiny Committee.
- Concerns were raised that the loss of a local bus service could result in greater isolation and residents feeling trapped in their own homes. This was an issue that affected those living in rural and urban areas.
- It was noted some voluntary transport schemes were reluctant to provide alternative transport because of the costs.
- It was also noted many rural areas had no bus service at all and it was suggested all those affected by a change or loss of service should work with all stakeholders to lobby bus companies. Stakeholders could include parish councillors, district or borough councillors, local residents groups and bus users.
- The cost of providing a service was noted as was the inability of the county council to subsidise services that were barely used.

At this point the Leader of the Council, Councillor Jim Harker proposed an amendment to the final sentence of the motion that the issue would be referred to the Environment, Development & Transport Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Bob Scott accepted this amendment.

Upon the vote the motion, as amended was accepted.

**RESOLVED that:** Upon the vote the motion as amended was accepted.
Cabinet Business:

The Chairman referred Council to written questions and the answers received (appendix 1 to the minutes). In answer to supplementary questions the following was confirmed.

- The European Office of the Northamptonshire Enterprise Partnership (NEP) employed 2 members of staff who had been able to attract millions both directly and indirectly to the county.
- Individual schools were responsible for ensuring pupils on exam leave were provided with opportunities to revise for their exams.
- The Council would continue to work closely with OFSTED and the Department for Education to improve standards in schools.
- The Council was working with local communities affected by the stretch of the A6 between Finedon and Junction 10 of the A14 to resolve issues.

Verbal questions were then answered as follows:

- Bed blocking was an issue that affected many hospitals and not just those in the county. A review of care pathways would consider methods for alleviating this issue. Adaptations to patients’ properties were managed by borough and district councils.
- The county’s economy was boosted by approximately £1.2billion each year through tourism. NEP did not have the resources to work in this area and the Council was working with other partners and local businesses to attract further interest in the county.
- Details of the county’s share of the £94million that had been reported as taken from local authorities by Central Government in error would be provided following the meeting.
- A response would be provided following the meeting regarding data from academies which would assist to track under-performance for particular demographics of children.
- No member of the Cabinet held a corporate credit card.
- A recent review of the work of NEP, undertaken by an external company had highlighted an issue in the number and variety of additional tasks it was asked to perform by the Council. This would be addressed to ensure NEP could remain focussed on their remit.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the responses provided to written and verbal questions on the work of Cabinet.

Overview & Scrutiny Annual Report 2012-13:

At the Chairman’s invitation, the former Scrutiny Champion, Councillor Allen Walker proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating this would be his last report as Scrutiny Champion as this post had been deleted. He felt the Council’s Overview & Scrutiny function was the most open and transparent in the country. He felt proud of supporting officers and councillors who ensured the work of cabinet was held to account. He concluded by thanking councillors and officers for the time they gave to ensuring the function worked well now and was fit for purpose in the future.

The report was seconded by Councillor Dudley Hughes who thanked Councillor Walker for championing scrutiny through the Council and ensuring work was undertaken where it was needed.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was felt Overview & Scrutiny in the Council was performed in a much more open and transparent way to other councils.
• It was suggested participation in Overview & Scrutiny would be good for all councillors, particularly those on the Environment, Development & Growth Scrutiny Committee.

• Councillor Walker was thanked for his hard work during what had sometimes been difficult times, particularly as officer support for scrutiny work had reduced.

In reply Councillor Walker thanked councillors for their comments and stated he hoped scrutiny would continue to be successful, open and transparent in the forthcoming years.

**RESOLVED that: Council noted the Overview & Scrutiny Annual Report 2012-13.**

46/13 Motions Submitted by Councillors Under Rule 13.1:

There were none.

47/13 Urgent Business:

There was none.

48/13 Exempt Business:

There was none.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 2.25pm.

Jenny Rendall
Democratic Support
June 2013

**Chairman’s Signature:-**
**Date:-**
Subject: Monthly Capital Report (MCR) as at the end of February (Period 11) for the financial year ending 31 March 2014.

Recommendations:

That Cabinet:

1. Notes the current capital financial position for the financial year 2013-14 and the expenditure and funding of subsequent financial years.

2. Formally approves ten new capital schemes, totalling £16,272,009, and two budget revisions to existing committed capital schemes into the Council’s Committed Capital Programme following Capital Investment Board (CIB) recommendation.

3. Formally delegates the detailed funding streams to be earmarked to the revised budget for the Schools Expansions PFI Wave 2 to the Capital Investment Board.

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The report sets out the current financial position of the Council’s Capital Programme both in terms of totality, Directorate and on a scheme by scheme basis.

1.2 Cabinet is formally requested to give approval toward capital schemes entry into the Council’s Committed Capital Programme following recent recommendation at the monthly meeting of the Capital Investment Board.

2. Relevant Priority Outcomes

2.1 The content of this report supports the delivery of the following corporate outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance – to finance our vision, what must we do efficiently, effectively and economically?</td>
<td>• Maximised income and new funding mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exploited fixed assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Targeted spend and investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainable social resourcing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Background

3.1 The Council’s Capital Programme outturn figures over the past four years have totalled £119m (2009-10), £141m (2010-11), £122m (2011-12) and £101m in 2012-13 and this year’s forecast outturn stands at £121m.

3.2 The current external funding environment and continued announcements from central government on capital schemes also highlight the need to ensure that appropriate monitoring, governance and approval of the Council’s Capital Programme is undertaken.

3.3 Due to the significant levels of capital investment prioritised by the Council and as a key enabler in the growth, prosperity and economic wellbeing of the county the Council considers that a separate Capital Programme monitoring report is produced, reviewed and approved by Cabinet monthly in line with reporting on revenue expenditure.

4. Consultation and Scrutiny

4.1 This report has been produced in consultation with Corporate Directors, Assistant Directors, Heads of Service, department management teams and budget managers. The report is also subject to scrutiny through the Fiscal Outturn Sub Group of the Financial and Performance Scrutiny Committee.

5. Executive Summary

5.1 The key headlines this month are:

- The Council’s Capital Programme full year forecast outturn for 2013-14 now stands at £121million (decrease of £11m compared to last month), the by Directorate forecast outturn phasing can be found in Table 4 on page 9.

- Cabinet is formally requested to approve ten new capital schemes and two budget revisions to existing schemes (detailed in section 7) for inclusion in the Council’s Committed Capital Programme following recommendation by the Capital Investment Board (CIB) on the 12th March 2014.

6. Commentary Full Year 2013-14

6.1 Detailed Directorate summaries explaining the significant variances and movements occurring within each area are set out in section B (page 10) below.

6.2 The Council’s Capital Strategy 2014-15 to 2018-19, agreed at Full Council in February 2014, approved £47.65m of additional Council discretionary capital funding over this same period.

6.3 The Capital Strategy also approved a Development Pool of capital schemes that were given indicative prioritisation against the £47.65m fund over the five year period with formal bids to follow to enable the schemes to commence.

6.4 Table 1 over the page provides the detailed scheme by scheme prioritised balances agreed by Full Council and the remaining balances to be progressed through the Council’s capital approval routes for Cabinet approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Pool Discretionary Funding</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Cabinet Approvals To Date</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2014-15</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2015-16</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2016-17 to 2018-19</th>
<th>Total Prioritised Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Management</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT - Infrastructure</td>
<td>6,907</td>
<td>3,122</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>3,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Angel IT</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Farm</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM – Minor Works</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfast Broadband</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daventry Library</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Impact Fund</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moat Lane Library</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sywell Country Park Spillway</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Discretionary Funding Balance</td>
<td>47,650</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>10,968</td>
<td>10,337</td>
<td>22,166</td>
<td>43,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Summary of Development Pool discretionary capital funding prioritisation 2014-15 to 2018-19 after Cabinet in March.

6.5 In addition to discretionary approvals the Council has also prioritised £105.65million of Innovative and Invest to Save capital funding over the plan period toward schemes within the Development Pool (Table 2 provides the detail of each of these schemes).

6.6 These schemes support the Northamptonshire economy with key infrastructure projects that act as a catalyst to wider economic growth. Individual invest to save projects also contribute to Council efficiency savings to enable budgetary targets to be delivered. These assist in the Council being able to reduce revenue levels in line with grant reductions and ongoing austerity measures but at the same time being able to continue to support the delivery and improvement of front line services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Development Pool Innovative &amp; Invest to Save Funding</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Approvals To Date</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2014-15</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2015-16</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2016-17 to 2018-19</th>
<th>Total Prioritised Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest to Save</td>
<td>Project Angel</td>
<td>43,805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>21,864</td>
<td>17,174</td>
<td>43,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>A45 DDL</td>
<td>35,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>18,103</td>
<td>35,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>A43 Northern Approach</td>
<td>21,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>21,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2 – Summary of Development Pool Innovative & Invest to Save capital funding prioritisation 2014-15 to 2018-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Development Pool Innovative &amp; Invest to Save Funding</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Approvals To Date</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2014-15</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2015-16</th>
<th>Prioritised Balance 2016-17 to 2018-19</th>
<th>Total Prioritised Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Rail Bridge - Wellingborough</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest to Save</td>
<td>ASC – Reviews</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Discretionary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding Balance</strong></td>
<td>105,645</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,704</td>
<td>46,864</td>
<td>44,077</td>
<td>105,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Recommendations by Capital Investment Board (CIB)

7.1 Each month the Capital Investment Board (CIB) meets to discuss and recommend new capital projects for inclusion in the Council’s capital programme. Cabinet are then asked to review and approve these schemes and agree that they should be formally entered into the Council’s Committed Capital Programme.

7.2 The CIB met on the 12th March and has recommended ten new capital schemes, totalling capital investment of £16,272,009, to go forward for Cabinet approval.

7.3 The CIB has also recommended two budget revisions to existing committed capital schemes to go forward for Cabinet approval in April. These are summarised in table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Status</th>
<th>Capital Scheme Title</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure Requiring Approval £</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Radstone Fields Primary School</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>Developer Section 106</td>
<td>Proposal to build new school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Diamond Learning Community Extension</td>
<td>2,665,000</td>
<td>DfE Basic Need Grant, School Contribution &amp; recycled capital funding</td>
<td>Scheme to restructure school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>A45 Daventry Development Link – preparatory</td>
<td>2,050,000</td>
<td>Council Innovative Funding</td>
<td>Proposed Initial design and survey costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) 2014-15</td>
<td>1,216,939</td>
<td>DfE UIFSM capital grant</td>
<td>Proposed allocation of funding for free school meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Status</td>
<td>Capital Scheme Title</td>
<td>Capital Expenditure Requiring Approval £</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pineham Barns Primary School – site purchase</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>DfE Basic Need Grant</td>
<td>Proposed acquisition of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Northampton Heritage Gateway (Phase 1)</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>HCA Contribution</td>
<td>Scheme to purchase Castle House and associated site works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Mobile Working in Adults &amp; Childrens – roll out stage</td>
<td>442,000</td>
<td>DoH capital grant</td>
<td>Proposed roll out of mobile working arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Country Park Tractor</td>
<td>42,400</td>
<td>Council discretionary loan</td>
<td>Proposal to replace Tractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Registration Service CRM development</td>
<td>35,670</td>
<td>RCCO</td>
<td>Proposed further development of CRM system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Oundle Library POD</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Council Discretionary Capital Funding - recycled</td>
<td>Proposal to provide self contained POD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Waste &amp; Energy Discovery Centre – version 2</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Northamptonshire Waste Partnership Contribution</td>
<td>Proposed increase in budget to existing scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Schools Expansion PFI Wave 2 - revision</td>
<td>-£5,140,646</td>
<td>Please see section 7.34 to 7.35</td>
<td>Proposed reduction in scheme budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Investment Recommendation</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,211,363</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3 - Summary of Capital Schemes Recommended by the CIB on 12th March 2014*

**Capital Scheme Narratives**

**Radstone Fields Primary School - £8,000,000**

7.4 This scheme proposes to build a new primary school at Radstone Fields in Brackley with a capacity to become two forms of entry (420 places), although the opening may be phased in terms of year groups and pupil numbers in each year. The school will serve the major development of 1,000 houses at Radstone Fields in Brackley.

7.5 The Section 106 agreement makes provision for a primary school site of 2.96 hectares. This includes 0.2 hectares which the Council will need to purchase in order
to secure sufficient site area for the full two forms of entry. Cabinet approval was obtained in September 2013 to acquire the site.

7.6 Northamptonshire County Council and South Northamptonshire District Council have been working closely with the developers on this scheme which will see the full project being funded from Section 106 agreements. The school design has been subject to detailed consideration to ensure it meets with planning regulations, planning consent and in line with the overarching housing and infrastructure development at Radstone Fields.

7.7 The school will be operated as an Academy under the Government’s Academy Presumption arrangements with the school opening planned for September 2016.

**Diamond Learning Community Extension - £2,665,000**

7.8 Oakway Infant and Junior Schools were amalgamated to form the Diamond Learning Primary last year and it is now proposed to undertake structural repairs and restructure works of the former Oakway Junior block to add a further 60 new pupil places.

7.9 The scheme will enable the school to operate as a three form of entry all the way through from reception to year 6, a total of 630 pupil places. The works will comprise; structural repairs to the former junior block; provide for 21 suitably sized classrooms; provide a link between the two former school buildings; build a new school hall; include a new entrance to provide a focus to the newly established school.

7.10 The scheme will be funded using £333,655 from DfE Basic Need Grant, £100,000 Schools Contribution and £2,231,345 from recycled/existing Serial Build capital schemes which have been funded using DfE capital grants.

**A45 Daventry Development Link – preparatory - £2,050,000**

7.11 This scheme seeks the approval to drawdown Council Innovative funding prioritised in the Council’s Capital Strategy 2014-15 to 2018-19. Initially £2.05m is required to undertake the design phase and associated geotechnical and archaeological surveys in preparation toward the build which is forecast to commence in late 2015, and be completed by March 2017.

7.12 The overall scheme will create the extra road network capacity required to release future growth developments and the scheme has been identified as a priority by the Northamptonshire ARC.

**Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) 2014-15 - £1,216,939**

7.13 The DfE has announced universal infant free school meals capital funding to support the infrastructure needed to improve the provision of school kitchen and dining facilities. This capital funding is to support the stated Coalition Government policy of providing every infant pupil (specific year groups) a free nutritious school meal.

7.14 This one-off grant has been allocated to Councils based on the their maintained school levels, with Northamptonshire receiving £1.2m. In line with the allocation methodology approach toward Academies the Council is proposing to devolve this funding to schools based on a simple per capita value for each eligible child, with an additional lump sum of £5,000 for the smaller number of infant-age schools who on average could be disproportionately affected.

7.15 The Nourish team will be writing to all schools setting out the approach, the advice and support that will be provided for the September 2014 implementation.

**Pineham Barns Primary School – site purchase - £900,000**

7.16 The Pineham Barns area is land situated between Northampton South (Swan Valley) and Kislingbury and provides for a development of 625 houses, construction of which is due to start shortly.

7.17 The Section 106 agreement provides for the site and financial contribution for a one form of entry Primary School; financial contribution for a Community Resource Centre
to provide meeting spaces and public services; and opportunity to purchase additional site space to allow for a two form entry school.

7.18 This scheme proposes the acquisition of further site space to enable the future school to operate as a two form entry in line with Council policies. This will ensure the school has capacity to serve both the Pineham Barns development and other housing developments in Banbury Lane, which will also be contributing financially to the new school/places through agreed Section 106’s.

7.19 This initial phase of acquisition will be funded from Department for Education Basic Need Capital Grant prior to the full scheme being submitted which will include developer contributions.

**Northampton Heritage Gateway (Phase 1) - £900,000**

7.20 This scheme seeks the approval into the Council’s Committed Capital Programme of £900k for the first phase of the Heritage Gateway scheme. This includes the acquisition of Castle House and the associated site works, including demolition costs, to realise the vision of the overall scheme and site.

7.21 The phase 1 costs will be funded from a contribution from the Homes and Community Agency (HCA) in lieu of the HCA park and ride development which is now to be developed in different forms. The contribution is expected to be received by the Council in Q2 2014-15.

**Mobile Working in Adults & Childrens – roll out stage - £442,000**

7.22 This scheme seeks to access £442k of Department of Health Personal Social Services Capital Grant as prioritised in the Council’s Capital Strategy 2014-15 to 2018-19. The scheme will roll out mobile devices to field based social care staff and their managers, as appropriate to the individual’s working requirements within the Council’s Adult and Childrens Services.

7.23 Originally £542k was prioritised toward developing mobile working as part of the CareFirst scheme of improvements and the initial £100k pilot scheme has provided smart phones to enable increased mobile working arrangements.

**Country Park Tractor - £42,400**

7.24 This scheme proposes the purchase of a new Country Park Tractor to replace the leased vehicle which has come to the end of its life.

7.25 Options to purchase the vehicle under a finance agreement have been explored, however the submitted proposal, to fund corporately and recover the costs over the life of the asset (10 years) offers the Council better value for money and would provide a more flexible repayment arrangement for the service. The repayment of the corporate loan would be funded from revenue contributions over the 10 year life of the asset with the service able to over or under pay dependant on the budget position in each year, providing the costs are recovered within the asset life.

7.26 Ownership from new provides better value for this kind of equipment which will have a significant trade in value when due for replacement.

**Registration Service CRM development - £35,670**

7.27 A Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay (RCCO) is proposed to further enhance the development of the Council’s Registration Customer Relationship Management asset system.

7.28 The scheme will enable continued IT development and increased functionality of on-line customer bookings and channel shift away from the Customer Service Centre and cover three key areas:

- On-line appointments to register a birth, death or marriage.
- To apply to attend a citizenship ceremony
• Apply for a license to become an approved venue or apply for a renewal.

**Oundle Library POD - £20,000**

7.29 This scheme proposes the installation of a self contained POD within Oundle Library for the Registration Service and others to use. This facility would be used by the Registrar during their office opening times and at other times to provide the private space required for delivery of the Council’s emerging Public Health and Children’s Centre Services offer.

7.30 The scheme would be funded from a declared underspend of Council discretionary capital funding on the Corby Library project which has now been returned for Council prioritisation.

**Waste & Energy Discovery Centre version 2 - £80,000**

7.31 This scheme was originally reviewed by the CIB in January 2013 and approved by Cabinet into the Council’s Committed Capital Programme in February 2013 with a budget of £250,000.

7.32 The proposal is to expand the scope of the current scheme to provide increased screening to protect the rear of the site from waste being moved as part of the recycling process. The scheme has been delayed to obtain planning permission for the extra screening.

7.33 In line with the original funding of £250,000 the additional £80,000 has been agreed to be funded from the Northamptonshire Waste Partnership.

**Schools Expansion PFI Wave 2 revision – (£5,140,646)**

7.34 The CIB reviewed an update on the Northampton PFI Wave 2 Extensions scheme which received entry into the Council’s Committed Capital Programme following Cabinet approval in October 2013. This scheme is complex given its size and commercial nature and the business case has been updated to reflect the latest position. A summary version of the updated business case is provided at Appendix 1.

7.35 The revised business case is supported by the CIB and the following recommendations are requested for approval by the Cabinet:

- The project budget is reduced from the original £27,000,000 to £21,859,35, a reduction of £5,140,646.

- The funding available for the scheme is reduced down from the original £27m to match the project budget outlined in the business case. Due to the multiple funding streams of this project officers will be formulating the most effective funding methodology to take forward the revised budget of £21.9m. This will include mitigating risk to the Council’s Capital Programme. The final proposed funding basis will be reported back through the Council’s capital governance processes.

8. **Capital Funding Announcements**

8.1 There have been no further external or Coalition Government capital funding announcements from the previous MCR.
### Table 4 - Capital Expenditure Phasing Outturn Forecast (by Directorate) 2013-14

**Period 11 - February**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Period 1</th>
<th>Period 2</th>
<th>Period 3</th>
<th>Period 4</th>
<th>Period 5</th>
<th>Period 6</th>
<th>Period 7</th>
<th>Period 8</th>
<th>Period 9</th>
<th>Period 10</th>
<th>Period 11</th>
<th>Forecast Full Year 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Development and Transport</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>5,766</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>5,047</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>7,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Families and Education</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>5,447</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>6,022</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>58,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Infrastructure / Development</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>2,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>4,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-265</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>10,563</td>
<td>13,598</td>
<td>11,558</td>
<td>14,036</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>10,096</td>
<td>7,396</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>14,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Year 2013-14 Monitoring Progression - Outturn**

**Phased Expenditure By Month**

![Phased Expenditure By Month Chart]

- **Actual**
- **Forecast**
- **Cumulative Actual**
- **Cumulative Last Year**

**Financial Year 2013-14**

**All Figures in £ 000's**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outturn</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance from</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance from %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Movement In Year**

- £2,000
- Movement From Previous Month: 12.93%
Section B – Detailed Directorate Summaries

9. Children, Families and Education (CFE)

Expenditure

9.1 The Directorate's Capital Programme expenditure projections for 2013-14 stand at £56.4m, which equates to 46% of the Council's forecast capital programme for 2013-14 which is a reduction of £9m when compared to the previously reported projections. The movement is explained by adjusting future cashflow to project timelines for a number of schemes;

- Serial Build schemes (£2.2m) – the projected underspend will be recycled to provide an extension at Diamond Learning Community school, a proposed new scheme where the underspend evidences successful project management and cost control on Council school projects enabling more schemes to be delivered with limited grant settlement;

- Hot school meals (£1.1m) – the remaining unspent budget has been carried forward to 2014/15. Expenditure plans will be refined in respect of this budget taking into account recent developments and the future business model for the Nourish service to provide better value for money;

- Northampton PFI Wave 1 Extensions (£1.6m) – it has been agreed that the lifecycle cost of the extensions will be paid monthly rather than through an upfront payment. The annual lifecycle cost will be £49,700 at 2005 prices indexed annually, which will be provided for in the Education Capital Programme

- The Academy Programme (£1.5m) - Revised cashflows to align with retention payments and pending external works

- Small movements (c£2.6m) in planned cash flows across a number of capital projects across the programme and the new schemes that have been agreed recently

9.2 During February 2014, the Directorate has spent 5% (£2.6m) of its annual capital planned expenditure for 2013-14

9.3 The Capital Investment Board received an update on the Northampton PFI Wave 2 Extensions, which was initially presented to Cabinet on the 8th October 2013. This scheme is complex given its size and commercial nature and the business case has been updated to reflect the latest position. The business case is supported by the Capital Investment Board and the following recommendations are requested for approval by the Cabinet:

- The project budget for the scheme is agreed at £21.9m
- The Kingsthorpe Village Primary School extension has been removed from the scheme as planning permission was not secured
- The removal of Kingsthorpe Village Primary and continued negotiation of costs has resulted in the decrease in the project costs
- The funding available for the scheme is reduced from the original £27m reported to Cabinet in October 2013 to match the project budget outlined in the business case
The annual cost of the Wave 2 extensions for the remainder of the PFI contract will be £0.48m consisting of:

- Lifecycle costs (£0.15m) indexed annually, which will be funded from the Education Capital Programme over the life of the contract; and
- Facilities Management costs (£0.33m) indexed annually, which will be funded through the Northamptonshire Schools Funding Formula to the relevant schools. This funding in turn is repaid to the Authority by way of the Academy Contribution or the School Contribution to the PFI scheme.

Due to commercial sensitivity a shortened version of the business case is provided at Appendix 1

**Funding**

9.4 The latest DfE capital funding announcements reported recently means that the Council has already committed the grant funding until 2015-16 in full and some of the 2016-17 funding to meet the current capital programme.

10. **Environment, Development and Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDT Summary</th>
<th>EDT Exc. Fire £m</th>
<th>Fire £m</th>
<th>EDT Total £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditure to Period 11</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>47.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast Expenditure 2013-14</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>55.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highways, Transport, Waste and Development Services**

**Expenditure**

10.1 The Capital expenditure forecast for Highways, Transport, Waste and Development services for 2013-14 has been revised to £53.75m from the P10 forecast of £54.40m. The £0.65m movement in forecast relates to schemes where works have been rescheduled into 2014-15 due to wet weather.

10.2 In 2013-14 the following main schemes will be delivered to bring significant improvements in infrastructure in the county, allowing for improved road network access and linkages, to help enable and support growth and development.

- Highways Investment and Maintenance £20.75m
- A43 Corby Link Road £18.67m
- Winter Damage - Essential Road Maintenance £3.96m
- Waterside Enterprise Zone Infrastructure £2.51m
- Project Angel (Design and Business Case) £2.77m
- A45/A5 Weedon Crossroads Improvements £0.83m
- Upton improvement works on behalf of HCA £0.73m
- Northamptonshire Superfast Broadband £0.76m
- Various small scale localised improvements £2.77m

**Funding**

10.3 There are no new funding announcements.
11. **Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service (NFRS)**

**Expenditure**

11.1 The capital expenditure forecast for NFRS for 2013-14 is £1.99m. The movement since period 10 of (£360k) is due to the delivery of the officer response vehicles slipping to quarter one of 2014-15.

11.2 The 2013-14 forecast relates to:

- Control Room Project (funded by DCLG Grant) £0.59m
- Fire Capital Grant schemes 2013-14 (DCLG funded) £0.35m
- Fire Capital Grant 2011-12 (DCLG Funded) £0.56m
- Fire Appliances – purchase of lease vehicles 2013-14 £0.22m
- Other schemes £0.27m

12. **Adult Social Care Services (DASS)**

**Expenditure**

12.1 The Directorate’s Capital Expenditure forecast for 2013-14 is £0.48m

12.2 The main projects in the 2013-14 Capital Programme include;

- Adults Services Redesign £0.27m

12.3 Finance continue to work with budget managers across the service to ensure each Individual project cashflow agrees with project timelines in 2014-15.

13. **Public Health and Wellbeing**

**Expenditure**

13.1 The Capital Programme forecast for Public Health in 2013-14 is £0.57m.

13.2 The main projects in the 2013-14 Capital Programme include;

- PHASE Housing in Northampton £0.15m
- Corby Library Pod £0.16m
- Country Parks Invest to Save £0.10m

14. **IT Infrastructure / Development**

**Expenditure**

14.1 The Capital expenditure forecast for IT Infrastructure and Development in 2013-14 is £2.17m.

14.2 The main projects in the 2013-14 Capital Programme include:

- Delivery of Corporate & Directorate Applications £0.69m
- Refresh of Computer PC’s, Printers, Handheld devices £0.60m
- Infrastructure Growth & Applications £0.22m
- IT E Forms £0.31m
- Other schemes £0.35m

**Funding**

14.3 There are no new funding announcements.
15. Property Maintenance

Expenditure

15.1 The service’s Capital Programme forecast expenditure for 2013-14 stands at £4.39m, and significant expenditure on the following schemes is planned:

- Property Planned Critical Maintenance £0.45m
- HQ Accommodation Strategy £0.39m
- Property and Asset Management Minor Works programmes £1.94m
- Property Capital Maintenance £0.56m
- Civic Library Building Towcester £1.00m
- Other schemes £0.05m

Funding

15.2 There are no new funding announcements

16. Chief Executive

Expenditure

16.1 The Chief Executive’s Capital Programme forecast for 2013-14 stands at £1.32m and includes IT schemes that are upgrading Oracle and CareFirst systems.

16.2 Significant expenditure on the following schemes is planned in 2013-14:

- Carefirst Social Care records and Financial Integration £0.30m
- Choices Implementation £0.15m
- Alchemy Replacement scheme £0.27m
- Oracle Convergence £0.25m
- Other schemes £0.35m

Funding

16.3 There are no new funding announcements

17. Alternative Options Considered

17.1 It is considered as best practice to brief members and report the latest budgetary position to Cabinet on a regular monthly basis, rather than less frequently, for example, quarterly. It also meets the Financial Regulations requirement to ensure the provision of financial information and compliance with financial management standards.

18. Financial Implications

18.1 The financial implications of this report are set out in sections 3 to 17 above.

19. Risk and Business Continuity Management

19.1 There are internal control processes in place to ensure that the Council does not spend beyond the resources available. Risk will be managed and monitored throughout the organisation during the delivery of the Council’s budget plans.

20. Appendices

- Appendix 1 - NCC Schools PFI Wave 2 Final Business Case
| **Author:** | **Name:** Mark Walker  
**Team:** LGSS Finance – EDT, CE, LGSS & Capital |
|---|---|
| **Contact details:** | **Tel:** 01604 366054  
**Email:** mawalker@northamptonshire.gov.uk |
| **Background Papers:** | **Business Objects Planning monitoring returns,**  
**Head of Service Reports and Capital Monitoring spreadsheets,**  
**DMT Meetings and Government Announcements** |
| **Does the report propose a key decision is taken?** | **YES** |
| **If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan?** | **YES** |
| **Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here** | **NO** |
| **Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework?** | **NO** |
| **Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)?** | **Yes**  
**Name of SFM:** Rosemary Pallot |
| **Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Capital Investment Board (CIB)** | **YES** |
| **Has the report been cleared by the relevant Director?** | **YES**  
**Name:** Matt Bowmer |
| **Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted?** | **YES**  
**Cabinet Member:** Cllr Bill Parker |
| **Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted?** | **YES**  
**Scrutiny Committee:** Fiscal Outturns Sub Committee of the Financial and Performance Scrutiny Committee |
| **Has the report been cleared by Legal Services?** | **YES**  
**Name of solicitor:** Shahin Ismail |
| **Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?** | **YES**  
**Name of officer:** Simon Deacon |
| **Have any property issues been cleared by Property and Asset Management?** | **YES**  
**Name of officer:** Richard Beeby |
| **Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out in relation to this report?** | **YES** |
| **Are there any community safety implications?** | **YES** |
| **Are there any environmental implications?** | **NO** |
| **Are there any Health & Safety Implications?** | **NO** |
| **Are there any Human Resources Implications?** | **NO** |
| **Are there any human rights implications?** | **NO** |
| **Constituency Interest:** | **ALL** |
Proposals for Heritage Gateway revealed
03/06/2013

Proposals to create a new park space next to Northampton’s railway station are set to be considered as part of the town’s Heritage Gateway project.

What is the Heritage Gateway?

The Heritage Gateway aims to celebrate the town’s rich history, with a focus on the former Northampton Castle site, as well as emphasising other important heritage features in the surrounding area, including St Peters Church, the only remaining building in the area that existed at the same time as the castle.

The five-year project includes a plan to purchase and demolish nearby vacant office block Castle House, to create a new public space and parkland for local residents, businesses and visitors to the town.

The project would also see the creation of a heritage trail, new exhibition panels within the railway station, promotion of its proper name ‘Northampton Castle Station’ and improved landscaping and lighting around the area.

Who is involved?

Northamptonshire County Council, Northampton Borough Council, West Northamptonshire Development Corporation, Friends of Northampton Castle, the Churches Conservation Trust and the University of Northampton are working together on the Heritage Gateway project which will help residents and visitors discover the story of Northampton whilst also enhancing the appearance of this important entrance into the town.

What happens next?

A report detailing the project will be considered by county council cabinet members next Tuesday (11th June) and then will go to the borough council’s cabinet meeting the following day (12th June).

If approved, an initial £1.7m investment from the county council will kick-start the project, with
Proposals for Heritage Gateway revealed

County council cabinet member for economic growth and public protection Councillor Andre Gonzalez de Savage said: “The Heritage Gateway will raise the profile of Northampton’s history, highlighting the stories behind the origin of the castle, the county town and its people.

“As well as providing an enhanced sense of place and pride in the town and county’s heritage, this project will build on the work already underway to develop the new railway station, and will help to improve this key route into Northampton for residents, visitors and businesses alike.”

Councillor Tim Hadland, Northampton Borough Council's cabinet member for regeneration, enterprise and planning, said: “We feel that developing this site is an important step in improving the appearance of the town centre and the key route into Northampton, making everyone’s travels a pleasant experience.

“The addition of the heritage trail aims to uncover our proud and rich history including stories of monarchs, knights and quality craftsmen that once lived here. This trail will also emphasise several important heritage focal points attracting visitors to Northampton and informing local’s about the town’s past and hidden gems.”

On behalf of Friends of Northampton Castle, Dr Marie Dickie OBE said: "This is an exciting moment for all of us. Northampton has neglected its important medieval heritage for far too long, but now we can really make Northampton's past part of our future."

Peter Aiers, director south east of The Churches Conservation Trust said; “This is a great demonstration of the potential of partnership between the local authorities, the CCT and the local community. The Heritage Gateway concept will allow an overall plan which will tell a story of glorious past Northampton allowing everyone to access the history of the town and of the county. As the owners of the only contemporary building with the medieval castle we are keen that visitors can understand the context in which it once sat.”
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