

Council

18 July 2017

Capital Investment Fund – 2017/18 Quarter 1 Proposed Allocations

Recommendations

That Council:

- 1) Support the use of a maximum of £4.270 million of the Capital Investment Funds Capital Growth Fund to deliver the A444 Corridor Improvements – Phase 2, as part of an overall scheme costing £4.600 million.
- 2) Support the use of a maximum of £3.500 million of the Capital Investment Fund for the A3400 Birmingham Road Stratford Improvements.
- 3) Support the use of a maximum of £2.402 million of the Capital Investment Fund for the refurbishment of the Fire and Rescue Headquarters in Leamington.
- 4) Support the use of a maximum of £0.500 million of the Capital Investment Fund for creation of a WFRS Water Training Facility.
- 5) Agree to the funding allocated to each of the projects being reduced on a £ for £ basis if alternative sources of funding for the become available,
- 6) Agree any funding, above the level approved to meet any risks and contingencies needed is found from within the existing resources of the Business Unit sponsoring the scheme.
- 7) Subject to the approval of recommendations 1) to 4) above, add the schemes to the capital programme.

Cabinet on 13 July will be recommended (subject to the approval of recommendations 1) to 2) above) to authorise the Joint Managing Director (Communities) to invite tenders and enter into the appropriate contracts and grant

agreements on terms and conditions acceptable to the Joint Managing Director (Resources) for these schemes.

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1. As part of the 2017/18 budget Council approved the creation of the Capital Investment Fund (CIF) to provide an approach to funding capital schemes in support of the delivery of the One Organisation Plan 2020. The Fund currently has £56.207 million resources to be allocated over the next three years.
- 1.2. As part of operationalising this capital strategy Members, as well as approving a detailed set of evaluation criteria, approved a four stage approval process for projects seeking funding from the CIF that would be run on a quarterly basis:
- Stage 1: A service specific internal approval process, the conclusion of which is a bid to an Evaluation Panel submitted by the relevant Head of Service.
 - Stage 2: The CIF Evaluation Panel provide a technical evaluation and commentary on the proposal that results in a recommendation to Corporate Board.
 - Stage 3: Corporate Board review the evaluation and support/reject the proposal going forward to Members.
 - Stage 4: For those schemes Corporate Board support, Cabinet/Council approve/reject the allocation. If approved the scheme is added to the authority's capital programme.
- 1.3. This report forms Stage 4 of the process for the first quarter of 2017/18, with four bids being brought forward for approval requesting a maximum allocation of £10.672 million. The table below lists the bids and the appendix that contains a summary of Evaluation Panel's assessment to Corporate Board that that has been attached to aid Members decision-making.

Bid Title	CIF Funding Request £m	Evaluation Score	Appendix
A444 Corridor Improvements – Phase 2	4.270	63.5	A
A3400 Birmingham Road	3.500	72.5	B
Fire Headquarters	2.402	59.5	C
WFRS Water Training	0.500	74	D
Total	10.672		

- 1.4. The remainder of this report outlines a description of each of the schemes and the impact on the CIF of the recommendations from Corporate Board

2. Description of the Schemes

2.1. A444 Corridor Improvements – Phase 2

The A444 Corridor Improvements project aims to transform the strategic gateway to Nuneaton, addressing congestion issues on the A444 growth corridor, managing the flow of traffic where several key routes converge, improving highway capacity, network resilience, journey time reliability and pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure to stimulate business activity and realise planned employment and housing growth over a 15-20 year horizon. The Corridor scheme overall will be delivered in 2 phases. Phase 1, the A444 Coton Arches Roundabout Signalisation was approved in July 2016. This proposal is for Phase 2, more specifically the A444 College St junction to B4112 Heathend Rd and Greenmoor Rd junction improvements. There are also wider links to the overall Transforming Nuneaton project.

The total cost of the scheme is £4.600 million, including a contribution of £4.720 million from the CIF.

2.2. A3400 Birmingham Road, Stratford Corridor Improvements

The project aims to improve transport infrastructure along the principal arterial route linking Stratford Town Centre and the A46 Stratford northern bypass. The improved infrastructure will help to address existing congestion issues along the route that are damaging to local productivity and undermine the arrival experience for the town's tourist and visitor economy. The improvements will also help unlock planned housing and employment sites in the corridor and support wider growth in the area. Specifically the project will deliver:

- Road widening to two lanes (inward bound)
- Conversion of the existing two lane outbound sections to inbound
- A new slip road to the Tesco retail area
- Improvements to the pedestrian and cycle environment along the southern end of the corridor, ensuring good connectivity to the proposed development of a cultural area in the vicinity of Arden Street.

The total cost of the scheme is £3.500 million, with all funding coming from the CIF. A bid to part fund this scheme has also been submitted to the DfT National Productivity Investment Fund for between £2 million and £2.5 million which, if successful, would make a significant contribution to the funding of the scheme.

2.3. Fire Headquarter Refurbishment

This project is focused on delivering a modern flexible office and support environment for HQ staff in Leamington Spa. Briefly the proposal comprises

the refurbishment of significant elements of the Headquarters office space and the provision of building WC and changing facilities that meet current building standards. Work will include the replacement of all glazing with modern double glazed, improvements to the buildings energy efficiency which should improve comfort within the office environment and thermal performance of the building fabric with an improvement in building revenue costs.

The total cost of the scheme is £2.402 million, with all funding coming from the CIF.

2.4. **WFRS Water Training Facility**

This submission outlines a requirement for WFRS for a Water Rescue Training facility at its new Training and Development Centre, to ensure firefighter and public safety in responding to an increasing number of flooding and water rescue incidents. The estimated capital cost is £500,000, with anticipated net revenue savings of £27,000 per year and potential income generation of £30,000 per year. All of the capital funding would come from the CIF.

3. **Impact on the Capital Investment Fund**

3.1. There is currently £56.207 million in the CIF available for allocation over the next three years. Table 2 shows how the recommended allocations impact on the total amount available, whilst retaining a minimum of £7.5 million for allocation in any future year.

3.2. There are no unfunded running costs or liabilities for the County Council as a result of investing in these projects. Once the projects are complete the capital financing costs will be approximately £850,000 a year. Provision for this cost forms part of 2017-20 medium term financial plan.

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Future Years	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Funding Available	41.252	7.455	7.500	-	56.207
Less recommended CIF allocations:					
• A444 Corridor Improvements Phase 2	-	-	-	-	-4.270
• A3400 Birmingham Road, Stratford	-0.150	-0.350	-3.000	-	-3.500
• Fire Headquarters	-1.441	-0.841	-0.120	-	-2.402
• WFRS Water Training	-0.150	-0.350	-	-	-0.500
Reallocation of funding between years	-8.556	5.436	3.120	-	0.000
Remaining Fund Balance	30.535	7.500	7.500	-	45.535

4. Consideration by Cabinet

Cabinet will be considering this report and the recommendations at its meeting on 13 July. The allocation of £10.672 million funding is above that delegated to Cabinet and therefore approval of the scheme needs to be made by full Council. If the Cabinet make any amendments to the proposed recommendations, these will be reported to this Council meeting.

Background Information

None

	Name	Contact Information
Report Author	Virginia Rennie	vrennie@warwickshire.gov.uk
Head of Service	John Betts	johnbetts@warwickshire.gov.uk
Joint Managing Director	David Carter	davidcarter@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Peter Butlin	peterbutlin@warwickshire.gov.uk

The report was circulated to the following members prior to publication:

Local Members consulted

A444 Corridor Improvements – Councillors Bill Olnor, Caroline Phillips, Andy Sargeant

A3400 Birmingham Road, Stratford – Councillor Kate Rolfe

Fire and Rescue HQ Leamington – Councillor Nicola Davies

Water Training Facility – Councillors Andy Crump and Bob Stevens

Cabinet Portfolio Holder: Councillor Peter Butlin

Resources and Fire & Rescue Overview and Scrutiny Spokespersons:

Councillors Heather Timms (Chair), Parminder Singh Birdi (Vice Chair), Maggie O'Rourke and Sarah Boad

Evaluation of the A444 Corridor Improvements – Phase 2

1. Proposal

- 1.1. A £4.600 million allocation from the Capital Investment Fund as part of an overall funding package to complete Phase 2 of the A444 Corridor improvements.
- 1.2. The A444 Corridor Improvements project aims to transform the strategic gateway to Nuneaton, addressing congestion issues on the A444 growth corridor, managing the flow of traffic where several key routes converge, improving highway capacity, network resilience, journey time reliability and pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure to stimulate business activity and realise planned employment and housing growth over a 15-20 year horizon.
- 1.3. The Corridor scheme overall will be delivered in 2 phases. Phase 1, the A444 Coton Arches Roundabout Signalisation was approved in July 2016. This proposal is for Phase 2, more specifically the A444 College St junction to B4112 Heathend Rd and Greenmoor Rd junction improvements. There are also wider links to the overall Transforming Nuneaton project.
- 1.4. The proposal has been submitted to the Capital Investment Fund under the strategic investment/economic growth category.

2. Evaluation Summary

- 2.1. The evaluation score for the scheme is 63.5%. The breakdown across the four categories is shown in Table 1.

Category	Score (out of 5)	Weight	Weighted Score (out of 100)
Alignment with the organisations strategic objectives	3.5	15%	10.5
Financial viability	3	30%	18
Strategic Investment/Economic benefit	3	45%	27
Political, social and environmental impact	4	10%	8
Total			63.5

- 2.2. On the basis of the information provided in the business case, a maximum allocation of £4.600 million from the Capital Investment Fund is recommended.
- 2.3. The score is towards the lower end of those that would usually be recommended for approval. This is because of concerns that the Nuneaton and Bedworth Local Plan is still only draft and hence the allocation of housing and employment sites may change and the difficulty in evaluating the benefits of the various schemes currently in development to support the regeneration of Nuneaton in isolation.
- 2.4. It is also recommended that the allocation is subject to the condition that if any additional funding is secured from other sources, the allocation from the Capital investment Fund is reduced on a £ for £ basis and that, by approving a maximum allocation of £4.600 million, if additional funding is required it is found from within the existing Transport and Economy capital programme allocations.

3. Alignment with the Organisation's Strategic Objectives *(score 3.5 out of 5)*

- 3.1. The bid is consistent with and supports the OOP 2020 priority of "the economy is vibrant and supported by the right infrastructure".
- 3.2. If delivered as envisaged, the proposal aligns well with the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council local plan and the SEP. However, as the plan is still in draft and other key stakeholders have yet to be consulted, some uncertainty about the proposal and the delivery of the expected benefits remains. It is for this reason the proposal only scored 3.5 out of 5.

4. Financial Viability *(score 3 out of 5)*

- 4.1. Full funding for the proposal requires £350,000 of S106 funding. This has yet to be secured. In addition, a bid was made to the CWLEP Growth Fund for a contribution towards the scheme. This was unsuccessful. So external funding is a maximum 7% of the total scheme funding.
- 4.2. A standard 44% contingency forms part of the scheme outline costings and it is planned to deliver the scheme alongside the Coton Arches scheme. Both are positive factors when considering the schemes financial viability.

- 4.3. However, alongside these positives there are also outstanding financial risks. For example, need for land acquisition which may impact on costs and timescales will only be clarified as part of the detailed scheme design.
- 4.4. It is these remaining financial risks and the low level of match funding that led to the score of 3 out of 5 for financial viability.

5. Strategic Investment/Economic Growth *(score 3 out of 5)*

- 5.1. The A444 Corridor scheme is designed to enable and stimulate growth along the corridor. It will improve road and sustainable transport access to existing and planned employment and housing sites. Modelling suggests 1,063 jobs linked to the delivery of the scheme. When combined with the Phase 1 Coton Arches scheme the package provides a benefit/cost ratio of 6.51 and a net present value of £38.850 million.
- 5.2. The proposal provides a clear link to NBBC draft local plan and there is evidence provided in the business case as a result of modelling that accessibility would be improved.
- 5.3. If the predicted benefits and economic growth are delivered the evaluation suggests the scheme would have a positive impact. However, with the exception of forecast improvement in congestion, the forecast benefits are hard to measure or directly attribute to the scheme.
- 5.4. There is a concern that the S106 funding required is dependent on the growth enabled by the development materialising in a timely way. Also there is a risk that the investment will result in the congestion being displaced towards the main areas of employment growth.
- 5.5. The area of greatest concern from the Panel's perspective was the risk of the piecemeal approach to schemes coming forward that are designed to support/deliver economic growth in Nuneaton, with a number of other schemes currently in development. This makes it difficult to evaluate the benefits each scheme individually, how all the schemes fit together, the overall vision for the regeneration of Nuneaton and the level of interdependency in the delivery of the benefits.
- 5.6. It is these reservations that led to the scheme scoring 3 out of 5 for economic benefits and resulted in Corporate Board requiring future schemes that

contribute to the regeneration of Nuneaton (or any other area) are placed in context and are accompanied by an overall vision.

6. Political, Social and Environmental Impact *(score 4 out of 5)*

6.1. Overall the Panel felt that the political, social and environmental impact of the project was high. The Panel felt the investment aims to:

- Develop local infrastructure in a way that is seen as beneficial locally
- Support CWLEP, NBBC and County Council key priorities with links to other high profile schemes included in the NBBC IDP
- Improve access to employment and housing development sites
- Improve congestion and sustainable travel options including cycleways and pedestrian access
- Increase the potential for economic growth in Nuneaton, an area with high levels of deprivation, through opening up access in the local area.

Evaluation of the A3400 Birmingham Road Corridor Improvements

1. Proposal

- 1.1. A £3.500 million allocation from the Capital Investment Fund for the A3400 Birmingham Road, Stratford Corridor Improvements.
- 1.2. The project aims to improve transport infrastructure along the principal arterial route linking Stratford Town Centre and the A46 Stratford northern bypass. The improved infrastructure will help to address existing congestion issues along the route that are damaging to local productivity and undermine the arrival experience for the town's tourist and visitor economy. The improvements will also help unlock planned housing and employment sites in the corridor and support wider growth in the area.
- 1.3. Specifically the project will:
 - Road widening to two lanes (inward bound)
 - Conversion of the existing two lane outbound sections to inbound
 - New slip road to the Tesco retail area
 - Improvements to the pedestrian and cycle environment along the southern end of the corridor, ensuring good connectivity to the proposed development of a cultural area in the vicinity of Arden Street.
- 1.4. The proposal has been submitted to the Capital Investment Fund under the strategic investment/economic growth category.

2. Evaluation Summary

- 2.1. The evaluation score for the scheme is 69.5%. The breakdown across the four categories is shown in Table 1.

Category	Score (out of 5)	Weight	Weighted Score (out of 100)
Alignment with the organisations strategic objectives	4	15%	12
Financial viability	3.5	30%	21
Strategic Investment/Economic benefit	3.5	45%	31.5
Political, social and environmental impact	4	10%	8
Total			72.5

2.2. On the basis of the information provided in the business case, a maximum allocation of £3.500 million from the Capital Investment Fund is supported.

2.3. It is also recommended that the allocation is subject to the condition that if any additional funding is secured from other sources, the allocation from the Capital investment Fund is reduced on a £ for £ basis and that, by approving a maximum allocation of £3.500 million, if additional funding is required it is found from within the existing Transport and Economy capital programme allocations.

3. **Alignment with the Organisation’s Strategic Objectives** (score 4 out of 5)

3.1. The bid is consistent with and supports the OOP 2020 priority of “the economy is vibrant and supported by the right infrastructure”. If delivered as envisaged, the proposal aligns well with the Stratford District Council local plan and is listed in the district’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan as a requirement of delivering the local plan. It is for this reason the proposal scored 4 out of 5.

4. **Financial Viability** (score 3.5 out of 5)

4.1. Financial viability is the lowest scoring element of the bid’s overall evaluation. This is for two main reasons. The first is that there is no external funding providing any contribution to the delivery of the scheme. This is despite the scheme providing a slip road into the Tesco retail area, which will inevitably be positive for the site and was included previously as a requirement of Tesco gaining planning permission to extend the store on the site (this extension has not been taken forward to date). A bid has been submitted to the DfT National Productivity Investment Fund for between £2 million and £2.5 million which, if

successful would make a significant contribution to the funding of the scheme. It is for this reason the Panel recommend including the additional recommendation that if any external contribution is received towards the scheme the Capital Investment Fund is reimbursed.

- 4.2. As part of the road widening the purchase of a small section of additional land may be required. This land will be sought by agreement with the landowner but there is a risk that a Compulsory Purchase Order may be required. This could impact on the overall cost of the scheme. Although this is mitigated by the standard 44% contingency that forms part of the scheme outline costings and builds in a degree of robustness.
- 4.3. It is the financial risks that any match funding is currently unsecured that led to the score of 3.5 out of 5 for financial viability.

5. Strategic Investment/Economic Growth *(score 3.5 out of 5)*

- 5.1. The scheme is designed to enable and stimulate growth along the corridor. The impact of housing growth and other forecast demand will put further pressure on the already congested A3400. Modelling suggests 64 jobs will be created and the scheme provides a benefit/cost ratio of 13.92 and a net present value of £37.2 million. The cost benefit ratio is well above that for similar schemes.
- 5.2. The proposal provides a clear link to Stratford local plan and there is evidence provided in the business case as a result of modelling that accessibility would be improved. The primary driver of the growth figures are improvements in congestion for business users and commuting and leisure access.
- 5.3. If the predicted benefits and economic growth are delivered the evaluation suggests the scheme would have a positive impact and the forecast improvements in congestion means the benefits of the scheme can be directly measured.
- 5.4. The area of greatest concern from the Panel's perspective was the risk of the piecemeal approach to schemes coming forward that are designed to support/deliver economic growth in Stratford. This scheme coming forward makes passing reference to other related capital programmes. These include:
 - The Stratford Transport Package – a package of schemes to provide additional capacity at key points on the highway network

- Phase 2 Birmingham Road – provision of a new link road between Alcester Road and Birmingham Road
- The Canal Quarter redevelopment
- Redevelopment of the Arden site on the former cattle market site and Stratford-upon-Avon station

Whilst it is recognised that the scheme not going is unlikely to affect other work being done, it makes it difficult to evaluate the benefits each scheme individually, how all the schemes fit together, the overall vision for the growth of Stratford town centre and the level of interdependency in the delivery of the benefits.

- 5.5. It is these reservations that led to the scheme scoring 3.5 out of 5 for economic benefits. The Panel would also recommend that future schemes that contribute to the growth of an area are placed in context and are accompanied by an overall vision.

6. Political, Social and Environmental Impact *(score 4 out of 5)*

- 6.1. Overall the Panel felt that the political, social and environmental impact of the project was high. The Panel felt the investment aims to:
- Develop local infrastructure in a way that is seen as beneficial locally
 - Support CWLEP, SDC and County Council key priorities with links to other high profile schemes included in the SDC IDP
 - Improve congestion and sustainable travel options including cycleways and pedestrian access
 - Increase the potential for economic growth in Stratford.
- 6.2. There is a reputational risk of not supporting the project as public consultation on highways developments in the area has already been undertaken and was identified as the second highest priority. The local MP is also publically supportive of the scheme.

Evaluation of the Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service Leamington Headquarters Investment

1. Proposal

- 1.1. This proposal for investment in Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters in Leamington is focused on delivering a modern flexible office and support environment for HQ staff. Briefly the proposal comprises the refurbishment of significant elements of the Headquarters office space and the provision of building WC and changing facilities that meet current building standards. Work will include the replacement of all glazing with modern double glazed, improvements to the buildings energy efficiency which should improve comfort within the office environment and thermal performance of the building fabric with an improvement in building revenue costs.
- 1.2. The total cost of the scheme is £2.402 million, with all funding coming from the CIF.

2. Evaluation Summary

- 2.1. The application to the Capital Investment Fund for £2.402 million of funding to support the WFRSHQ proposal scored 59.5 out of 100. The breakdown of the score is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Outcome of the Evaluation			
Category	Score (out of 5)	Weight	Weighted Score (out of 100)
Links with the organisation's strategic objectives	2.5	15%	7.5
Financial viability	3	30%	18
Service delivery need	3	45%	27
Political, social and environmental impact	3.5	10%	7
Total			59.5

- 2.2. On the basis of the information provided in the business case the bid meets the criteria for funding reasonably well. The key reasons for this conclusion are that the project description was fairly clear, the financial viability of the project

is reasonable, being based on a low risk proposal of refurbishing the existing building.

3. Alignment with the Organisation's Strategic Objectives *(score 2.5 out of 5)*

- 3.1. The proposals are aligned to the organisation's strategic objectives. The proposal would directly contribute towards supporting people to be safe and make better use of resources.
- 3.2. The proposal is Fire and Rescue focused. This focus may be necessary, but there may be opportunities to create a multi-use building to broaden the range of services and activities in order to maximise usage of assets in the future. It is for this reason the proposal scored 2.5 out of 5.

4. Financial Viability *(score 3 out of 5)*

- 4.1. The proposal is relatively low risk, and includes a reasonable contingency (20%). Costing details have been provided, however a number of risks remain. These include the degree of certainty in the costings, the potential for additional cost driven by unforeseen developments such as asbestos complications (for which a £35,000 provision is set aside).
- 4.2. The bid sets out that the proposals should result in reduced building maintenance and utility costs, but at this stage does not estimate what they would be. Also, the assessment of knock-on impacts is limited and anecdotal in nature at this stage.
- 4.3. It is for these reasons the proposal scored 3 out of 5.

5. Service Delivery Need *(score 3 out of 5)*

- 5.1. A functional headquarters meets a service delivery need. However, it is difficult to determine with any degree of clarity to what extent the proposals improve functionality from being inadequate to being adequate.

- 5.2. If there were no action on to improve the facilities, running costs and productivity of the asset would gradually get worse. The proposals are expected to have a positive impact on facilities management costs.
- 5.3. An alternative has been considered in the past, in the form of developing a completely new headquarters a much higher cost. It is accepted that this was an unattractive option, but it is not clear the extent to which the proposal is consistent with the vision for the service at the end of the OOP 2020 period, if/why this was the only possible alternative option.
- 5.4. It is for these reasons the proposal scored 3 out of 5.

6. Political, Social, and Environmental Impact *(score 3.5 out of 5)*

- 6.1. The intention to redevelop/refurbish has broad Member support. There would be some environmental benefits, for example in terms of the removal of asbestos and improved energy efficiency. The proposal claims organisational benefits in the form of improved staff well-being and productivity.
- 6.2. It is for these reasons the proposal scored 3.5 out of 5.

Evaluation of the Water Rescue Training Facility

1. Proposal

- 1.1. The proposal is for creation of a Water Rescue Training Facility (WRTF) at the Fire and Rescue Service's new Training and Development Centre, to ensure firefighter and public safety in responding to an increasing number of flooding and water rescue incidents. The estimated capital cost is £500,000, with anticipated net revenue savings of £27,000 per year and potential income generation of £30,000 per year.

2. Evaluation Summary

- 2.1. The application to the Capital Investment Fund for £500,000 of funding to support the WRTF proposal scored 74 out of 100. The breakdown of the score is detailed in Table 1.

Category	Score (out of 5)	Weight	Weighted Score (out of 100)
Links with the organisation's strategic objectives	4	15%	12
Financial viability	3	30%	18
Invest to save	4	15%	12
Service delivery need	4	15%	12
Community capacity and well-being	4	15%	12
Political, social and environmental impact	4	10%	8
Total			74

- 2.2. On the basis of the information provided in the business case the bid meets the criteria for funding. The key reasons for this conclusion are that the project description was clear, the financial viability of the project is based on experience of similar works elsewhere, and the proposal would meet a number of service needs and organisational objectives as well as creating revenue savings and generating income.

3. Alignment with the Organisation's Strategic Objectives *(score 4 out of 5)*

- 3.1. The proposals are aligned to the organisation's strategic objectives. The proposal would directly contribute towards supporting people to be safe and make better use of resources.

4. Financial Viability *(score 3 out of 5)*

- 4.1. The key reason for the bid scoring 3 out of 5 for financial viability is the lack of detailed costing. Projected costs have been informed by similar works at other sites in the country in conjunction with surveyors from Property Services Business Unit. Overall the Service is content that the level of the bid is reasonable and recommendations 5) and 6) if approved would ensure no open-ended commitment from the CIF.
- 4.2. It is a relatively specialist and self-contained initiative with relatively few knock-on impacts that could put delivery at risk. A remaining financial risk is whether any other geographically close fire authorities are planning to invest in a similar facility as this would change the income generation expectations, although it is not expected to change the overall viability of the proposal.

5. Invest to Save *(score 4 out of 5)*

- 5.1. The proposal puts forward that it would deliver revenue savings both in the form of reduced water rescue training costs, and in the form of income generation through selling the use of the facility to other authorities.
- 5.2. The information put forward does not include sensitivity analysis of the proposals but the proposed impacts are relatively simple.

6. Service Delivery Need *(score 4 out of 5)*

- 6.1. The proposal would clearly meet a service need which already exists. Other than requiring input and support from some other business units (for example Property Services), the project would not have an impact on other business units.

- 6.2. If the project is not progressed, water rescue training will continue to be procured in its current form, at high cost.
- 6.3. The project will improve efficiency by setting up a local facility that reduces the cost of training. Project will improve quality by making Warwickshire a new centre for training others, which would lead to Warwickshire becoming a leading authority in having knowledge and expertise in this area.

7. Community Capacity and Well-Being *(score 4 out of 5)*

- 7.1. The project would clearly improve community well-being both by providing improved capability for water rescue where it is necessary, and improved reassurance to the community about capability.
- 7.2. The proposal does not specify how benefits would be measured. The number of rescue incidents is recorded but that would not necessarily reflect service benefits.
- 7.3. The community/public have not been consulted on this specific proposal in its own right, but the IRMP which is going out for public consultation includes a commitment to increase water rescue capability.

8. Political, Social, and Environmental Impact *(score 4 out of 5)*

- 8.1. The proposal would create an enhanced service offer which is likely to be well supported by partners and communities. The proposal would have a beneficial impact on the environment by eliminating the significant amount of travel required to the current training site, and the proposal would benefit the organisation by generating income, making revenue savings, and making Warwickshire a centre of excellence/training in respect of this expertise.