Detailed Business Case



Detailed Business Case

a. Title				
Project Name	Expansion of Church End Lower School, Marston			
Project location	Church End Lower School, Marston Moretaine			
Project Sponsor	Rob Parsons			
	Head of School Organisation, Admissions and Capital Planning			
Directorate	Children's services			
Type of scheme	Capital Project - over £60k			
Funding	External			

b. Project Information			
Project Purpose/ Outline Description	Church End Lower, located in central Marston Moretaine, is a Foundation Trust, maintained by the Vale of Marston Extended Services. There are 293 pupils currently attending, with a maximum capacity of 300 pupils.		
	As a result of demographic growth mainly due to the development of more than 400 additional homes at the development east of Bedford Road in Marston, and a further 135 houses at Moreteyne Farm, it is proposed that Church End Lower School will expand its capacity through a permanent building project to admit overall an additional form of entry (150 pupils) by September 2014.		
	The school is already receiving requests for admission for families moving in the catchment area and therefore has temporarily extended its admissions limit in each year to 68 pupils. In order to facilitate this rise of pupil numbers, a double mobile classroom will be installed on the current school site from September 2013 until the proposed completion of the permanent building works in Summer 2014.		
	This project will create a new one form entry school (150 places) within the Marston Park development, in order to create additional places at Church End Lower School.		
	The new school building will provide a minimum of 5 classrooms along with a servery/kitchen, dining/assembly hall and related support areas (toilets, storage and specialist teaching areas), along with external play spaces.		
	The new school building will provide school place to meet the demand arising from new housing developments and will be delivered by use of the		

	standardised design model Keynes from Willmott Dixon, via the SCAP framework, benefitting from lower costs and a shorter delivery period.		
	If approved, Church End Lower School will operate from September 2014 on a split site by use of a shared leadership team. Providing additional places in this way delivers required places in the centre of demand using an established and successful provider.		
Activities in Scope	The project will include project management and delivery of the capital scheme under the supervision of the Council and its professional consultants		
Out of scope/ exclusions	All necessary elements are covered within the scope of the project.		

c. Deliverables / outputs	
Deliverables:	
Deliverable	Date Due
New school building and associated external soft and hard play areas	September 2014

d. Options Appraisal		
Options	Although Church End Lower School is ideally located to admit pupils from the new development at Marston Park, the existing school site and buildings have a maximum capacity of 300 pupils. The site area at 14.6ha is insufficient to accommodate a further one form of entry without impacting on existing external play provision; such a project is achievable but will increase the cost, complexity and duration of the project.	
	As part of the S106 agreement, the developers will provide a 1.18ha site within the new Marston Park development, which will be handed over July 2013.	
	From analysis of various available options, Sunesis standardised design (Keynes model) has been selected.	
	The following options were discounted as part of the options appraisal process:	
	 Standard bespoke traditional build. While this can accommodate individual site anomalies, this would be the most expensive and lengthy option and requires a later implementation date of Easter or September 2015. Replication of a design used on Greenleas, Fairfield Park and Shefford (September 2013 implementation projects). This could bring reduced design time leading to a reduced cost, but due to the size of the new Church End site, it was deemed that none of the designs were suitable for adaption. 	
	Evaluation of Sunesis designs	
	Willmott Dixon offer a range of 4 standardised primary school designs, suitable for a range of projects and school sizes. Of these, two were suitable for use on the new Church End site as they were suitable for larger schools. The Newton model	

	was discounted as it is more suitable to an urban setting and provides only limited external play space.
	The Keynes model was chosen as the most suitable and appendix 1 shows outline designs for the proposed school.
	The Keynes standardised school design provides the following benefits:
	 Efficient design by use of flexible central corridor which can be adapted to be used as a creative play area, for learning resources and ICT, for special needs and smaller group teaching; Provision of basic facilities on the site (hall, kitchen/dining, staff/administration accommodation) to reduce unnecessary travel between sites during the school day; Lower project cost overall from a combination of lean construction processes, efficient use of space and shorter delivery period; Two additional classrooms within the standard 1FE model can be used to provide a pre-school base as well as accommodating community needs; Shorter programme length reduces the need for temporary accommodation on the main school site after Summer 2014; New build using a lightweight steel framed structure which reduces the need for expensive foundations in most site conditions; Small, compact footprint which allows optimal configuration of the new facilities on site; Fully energy efficient building which has much lower running costs.
Implications of "do nothing"	The Council would fail in its statutory responsibility (Section 14 of the Education Act 1996) which places a duty on Councils to secure sufficient and suitable school places for pupils in its area.
	If the project is not approved to go ahead, the council will not be able to provide sufficient lower school places in the Marston Moretaine area.
	Families are already moving into the school's catchment area causing the school to temporarily increase its limit in each year from 54 to 68 and permitting the need for the Council to provide a temporary classroom unit to provide sufficient accommodation.
	Once Church End Lower School is oversubscribed, families moving into the new homes would be required to transport their children to other locations, causing an increase in children being driven to school.
	If the specific expansion of Church End Lower School was refused, another school in the wider local area would have to be reconsidered for expansion, such as Shelton Lower School or Thomas Johnson Lower School. These schools have already been discounted on the basis of their distance to the area of greatest need.
	The expansion of Cranfield Academy (lower school) alone would be insufficient to meet the demand of demographic growth within Marston Moretaine.
	Further benefits such as increased community facilities and the providing school places in a new energy efficient building will be lost.
Project Delivery / Project Approach	The school and Central Bedfordshire educational planning officers have worked together constructively and positively in preparing this proposal. Central Bedfordshire will procure and appoint the contractor and ensure that the project conforms to all statutory requirements. The school will receive ongoing support

	from the School Organisation, Admissions and Capital Planning Team as the project progresses and project management support from the Council's Property & Assets Team.			
Dependencies	Church End has for many years maintained a reputation as a caring school with high standards in all aspects. This was endorsed recently in its last Ofsted inspection and in its continued high academic standards. The success of this project will be based on:			
	 Provision of new school building containing one classroom per year group, with appropriate additional support and external spaces, available from September 2014; 			
	 An efficient construction which considers the school's needs and concerns; The school opening on time in September 2014; The consideration and establishment of clear and transparent Admission 			
	 Criteria for the school as a whole; Continued high performance at the end of the EYFS, Key Stage 1 and Year 4; 			
	 The schools' ability to recruit and retain highly skilled practitioners in all roles. 			
Constraints	The new building is required to be ready for occupation for the 2014/15 Academic year.			
Assumptions	There are no assumptions being made in the development of this project which will also be subject to appropriate risk management strategies.			
Procurement route / options	Early appraisal of project options has shown that a standardised design is the preferred option, meaning that the project can be procured via the government approved SCAPE framework, avoiding the need to go through the comparatively lengthy open tender process.			
	The Sunesis standardised design, developed by Willmott Dixon, will be constructed by a prequalified supply chain, managed by the appointed main contractor, Willmott Dixon.			
	Adopting this procurement strategy avoids the need for a lengthy tender period as well as creating efficiencies in the overall project timetable which lead to a reduction in cost per square metre when compared to a traditional new school project, while still maintaining full accountability on the public purse			
Assessment of pre	eferred option			
Expected Benefits (opportunities) of	The expansion of Church End Lower School will support the Council and Children's Services priorities:			
this project	Statutory Duty			
	This project will ensure the Council continues to meet its statutory obligations to provide sufficient school places and also meets the legal requirements placed on the Council by the Education and Inspections Act 2006 regarding proposals to expand maintained schools.			
	Link to New School Places Programme, School Organisation Plan, CBC Education Vision			
	The School Organisation Plan 2012-2017 identifies a requirement to increase pupil			

place provision in Wootton area lower schools from 2013/2014, which translates to the identification of funding for 150 additional lower school places in this area by September 2014, as confirmed in Appendix C of the New School Places Programme 2012/13 to 2017/18.
CBC Education Vision identifies guiding principles which form the basis of educational planning and policy. In particular, this vision identifies the need to find local solutions in developing educational provision. Central to this is the commitment to schools working together in strong partnerships to develop what is in the best interests of learners and their local communities.
Alignment of School's Educational Vision against CBC's Policy Planning Principles for the Provisional of School Places
Church End Lower School is committed to an inclusive philosophy in which each child is valued and expected to make a positive contribution to their learning. The school wants each child to enjoy their schooling and experience a vibrant and challenging curriculum which stretches the boundaries of their academic performance and natural curiosity and imagination. Experience tells us that this is best achieved when strong partnerships are in place.
Standards at Church End are exceptionally high. Attaining and maintaining high standards is essential in providing children with the best possible start; the school prepares children well for their Middle School years.
Continuity of Provision It is essential that all children within the school's catchment area have the same entitlement. The school aims to ensure through effective management, high expectation and creative curriculum planning that this will be so.
Schools should be based around communities and the needs of their learners. At Church End the school periodically seeks the views of its community in identifying what those needs might be.
The proposals will ensure that local children will be able to attend their local school. The commitment towards belonging to the community will ensure that the school will be able to expand the services offered. This will include more Children's Centre provision. This is believed to be best for children and their families .
Marston Moretaine is a village that finds itself a little isolated from the larger towns of Central Bedfordshire. This project will enable schools to work together to encourage, develop and commission a range of activities and services benefitting the whole community.
The proposed model of governance, leadership and administration will be effective in ensuring high standards, financial viability and creative in its delivery.
To support their Educational Vision, Central Bedfordshire Council have prioritised the way we work together to optimise learning; Early Intervention, Commissioning and Partnerships.
Church End recognises that Early Intervention is essential in improving children's
F

life chances. Its experience has taught it that a range of Intervention Strategies combined with an effective multi-agency working can and does narrow the achievement gap. This work has included working closely with a Speech and Language and Play Therapist in developing effective individual and group therapy programmes. The school's commitment in supporting other schools is demonstrated through our recognition as an Outside Learning Excellence Hub which includes releasing one of its Assistant Headteachers to work with other CBC schools.
This project will enable the school to further develop its partnership with both the Marston Vale Children's Centre and Chimneytots Pre-School. Both will have the opportunity to expand their services to the village.
The partnership with the Vale of Marston Schools' Trust has already shown tremendous benefit to the community. It is anticipated that this work will develop further as the school explores further curriculum development, combined CPD and enrichment opportunity.
Church End is already Healthy Schools and Active Schools accredited. Working alongside the Redborne Sports Partnership and other local providers will ensure that Marston children have the best chance to make healthy life choices.
All that the school does is borne out of a desire to provide its children with the best possible life chances. The school has high standards in all that it does as is demonstrated in consecutive inspection outcomes and year on year high academic attainment. The promotion of compassion and a desire to be the best you can be flows through the school's ethos.
The Keynes standardised school design meets design standards for primary schools stated in Building Bulletin 99 for classrooms and teaching spaces and aligns to the Central Bedfordshire Council adapted model for lower schools. It also complies with Government guidance for acoustics, lighting, ventilation and special needs (Building Bulletins 93, 90, 101 and 102).
The standardised layout, based upon requirements for a primary school, will provide 7 full sized classrooms. Five will be used as classbases for Reception Year and Years 1-4, with the two remaining classrooms being used to accommodate nursery/pre-school children and family learning/community facilities.
The new building will provide:
 A full sized hall suitable for assembly, PE and dining; Teaching storage, space for coats and bags and toilet facilities directly adjacent to classrooms; A flexible large central corridor which provides a variety of different learning spaces including ICT, library and specialist areas; Direct access from classrooms to outside learning and play facilities; Kitchen and dining facilities; Staff and administration facilities; Playing field provision for team sports; On site car parking for staff and visitors.
Energy Efficiency and Environmental Impact

The new school building will be subject to compliance with the updated Building Regulations 2013, in particular with updated energy efficiency standards contained within Approved Document Part L2A (effective from October 2013). The regulations include a step change increase in energy efficiency requirements equivalent to a Display Energy Certification rating of 'B' and strategies to reduce the amount of heat gain in summer without the use of mechanical ventilation. Compliance will require the target emissions rate decided at design stage to be tested once construction is completed.

The standardised Keynes model primary school design has a target energy efficiency rating of 'A', through the use of efficient circulation areas (reducing the floor area which requires heating), energy efficient materials and clever orientation of the building on site to maximise solar gain in winter but to reduce solar gain in summer.

Willmott Dixon, the main contractor, will ensure that the construction phase has minimal environmental impact by:

- maximising the use of local labour and materials to reduce transport related emissions;
- employing modern construction methods which reduce waste and inefficiency;
- effectively controlling site based pollution.

Due to the expected over achievement of required energy efficiency and the use of a process which already guarantees a reduced environmental impact, it has not been deemed cost effective to carry out a BREEAM assessment.

DIRECT BENEFITS TO THE SCHOOL

The expansion of Church End Lower School will enable children from the school's catchment area to attend their local school. Recent years have meant that, in particular year groups there have been more applications than places available. This resulted in children attending school in neighbouring villages. The main benefits to the school are:

- Sufficient lower school places being provided for families within the village;
- A split/site school will have facilities at each of the site which will be fully exploited by the other ie hall, swimming pool, Children's Centre etc;
- An enlarged staff will bring fresh ideas, new skills and creative approaches;
- Economies of scale will enhance pupil to teacher/adult ratio;
- The split site will encourage creativity in overcoming difficulty areas such as curriculum development and communication;
- A restructured leadership team will help to retain and attract staff;
- The village maintains a sense of identity, belonging and togetherness.

WIDER BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

As well as specific educational benefits, the project will have other considerable benefits to the local community:

- As more parents can attend a school closer to their home address it is anticipated that this will ease traffic congestion around the Church End site thus reducing pollution and the risk of injury;
- It is anticipated that the village will have access to a wider range of evening/weekend activities;
- It is expected that the Marston Vale Children's Centre will be able to offer

	 parents a wider choice of parenting classes; Chimneytots will have opportunity to expand offering full-time provision to parents of 2, 3 and 4 year olds; Children will have access to a wider range of sporting opportunity; The new school will create employment and training opportunities for local people. 				
Disadvantages (threats) of this project	Threats and risks associated with this project will be managed by the school's Governing Body and Resources Committee as outlined in this business case.				
Impact Assessme	nt of preferred option				
Employee implications	As an expanding school, there will be a need to increase the number of teaching and non-teaching staff to support the increase in pupil numbers. This will be funded by the increased budget the school will receive from the Council.				
	In preparation for the expansion the school has recently consulted internally regarding a new management structure. With effect from 01 September 2013 the Leadership Team will comprise Headteacher, Deputy Headteacher and three Assistant Headteachers with responsibility for each of the three different Key Stages. From September 2014 two will be based at the Church End site and one at the new site, with the Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher moving between the two.				
Equalities Issues	No equalities issues are expected to arise as a consequence of the development. Indeed, the project intends to overcome any perceived inequalities by providing local places for local pupils. No pupils will be displaced by the proposals.				
Other impacts	None				
Strategic Assessn	nent of preferred option				
Statutory Duty & any legal implications	Section 14 of the Education Act places a duty on Councils to secure sufficient and suitable school places for its area. The Education and Inspections Act 2006 gives councils a strategic role as commissioners , but not providers, of school places to promote parental choice, diversity, high standards, the fulfilment of every child's educational potential and fair access to educational opportunity				
KPIs and key targets from MTP	The project supports Central Bedfordshire's medium term plan: Delivering your priorities – our plan for Central Bedfordshire 2012-2016 and the specific priority of improved educational achievement. The project will also assist the Council to manage growth effectively.				
Impact on the MTP – delivering your priorities	The school received a rating of 'Good' at the last inspection in April 2012. The school's academic and social performance is excellent which was also recognised by Ofsted in grading Reading and Behaviour as 'Outstanding'. As is demonstrated below, the schools performance is considerably better than the National Average at the end of Key Stage 1 and the National Expectation at the end of Year 4.				
	Key Stage 1 Results 2011/12SchoolLA in 2011National Average 2011[Teacher Assessment Average PointAverage Point1000000000000000000000000000000000000				

		Score]		
	Reading	17.5	16.6	15.8
	Writing	16.5	15.5	14.4
	Maths	16.4	16.4	15.7
	Overall	16.8	16.2	15.3
	Science	16.5	NK	NK
	End of Year 4 Results 2011/12	School [Teacher Assessment APS]	LA in 2011	Difference between school and national expectation (21 points)
	Reading	24.3	23.5	+3.3
	Writing	22.6	21.8	+1.6
	Maths	23.2	22.4	+2.2
	Overall	23.6	22.6	+2.6
objectives of the Service Fit to the objectives of the Capital Asset Management Plan (Capital Projects)	Vision, the Policy Principles and the School Organisation Plan. The project aligns with the Council's School Organisation Plan and the recently approved New School Places programme 2012-17			
Key risks	1			
Risk				
	 the interpreta 2. Land transfer projects (Gree could be an is 3. Current site or raised to mitig through full response to mitig following Exe shorter than a design is use 5. Objections raised to mitig the following the statement of the statem	tion of the site. Legation of the conditions . Difficulties with land enleas and Roecroft) ssue with this new sit conditions. Much of the gate against flooding esolution of outstandi ength. The length of cutive approval and p a traditional build, but d. <u>ised upon publication</u> ve consultation has ta	in the planning agree d transfers from development relating to services a e. he housing development in the area. This will ng S106 issues. design development publication of the stat fully achievable if a <u>n of statutory notice</u>	ement. elopers on other and access roads ent has been be addressed and construction cutory notice will be standardised A full and

	t two risks are critical to the sought to minimise their im		d prompt resolution
reviewe	sk register will be developed ed regularly by the school's F sation, Admissions and Capi	Resources Committee and	
f. Stakeholders involveme individuals and ensure that t			
Directorates	Keith Armstead, Senior Education Officer (Planning), School Organisation, Admissions and Capital Planning		
Members			
Public if applicable			
g. Timescales – key milest	ones		
Milestone		Start date	End date
Executive approval to commence		March 2013	
Information consultation period		22 April	20 May
Feasibility study completed		June 2013	
Publication of statutory notice		17 June 2013	
Site handover		July 2013	
Executive approval to commence		August 2013	
Planning permission granted		November 2013	
Construction period		Early January 2014	August 2014
	efects liability period)	August 2015	

	ance ails of how it is proposed that this project should be governed, this should as far as existing governance structures.
Project Sponsor	Keith Armstead, senior Education Officer (Planning), School Organisation, Admissions and Capital Planning
Project Manager	School
Project Board (if known)	Overall responsibility for the project will remain with the Headteacher who will report progress to the Governing Body through their Resources Committee. This committee comprises nine governors with significant and appropriate skills covering areas such as Health and Safety, Project Management, Procurement and

Accountancy. This committee meets at least monthly and reports to the Governing Body every three months.

i. Costs

1. Financial Case Summary

		<u>£'000</u>					
Expenditure Type	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	
Total Gross Capital Costs			1,026,889	2,216,307		3,243,196	
Total Gross Revenue Costs							
Total Costs							
Projected Gross Benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Impact to CBC	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	

	3,243,196		External Funding	-						
			Government Grant (Basic Need)	4.		605,526	1,905,430		2,510,956	
			Section 106			421,363	310,877		732,240	
			Section 278							
0	0		Lottery/ Heritage							
			Other Sources (School funding)							
<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>		Total External Funding	0	0	1,026,889	2,216,307	0	3,243,196	
		-								
			Internal Funding							
			Direct Revenue Financing						0	
			Capital Receipts						0	
			Borrowing						0	
			Total Internal Funding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
0		Est.	Total Funding	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,026,889</u>	<u>2,216,307</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,243,196</u>	_
ear 5	Total	Type *								
			3. Revenue Costs							
	142,500									
	142,500 0					£'0	00			r
				0	0	<u>£'0</u> 0	00 0	0		× 1
	0		Expenditure Type	0 Year 1	0 Year 2		_	0 Year 5	Total	F
	0 2,681,696		Expenditure Type a.One - Off Revenue Costs	-	-	0	0		Total	F
	0 2,681,696 198,000			-	-	0	0		Total 0	F C F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs	-	-	0	0			F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify)	-	-	0	0		0	F C F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 0 150,000		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify)	-	-	0	0		0	F C F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 0 150,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify)	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3	0 Year 4	Year 5	0 0 0	F C F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 0 150,000 0 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify)	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3	0 Year 4	Year 5	0 0 0	F C F T
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3	0 Year 4	Year 5	0 0 0	F 5 F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3	0 Year 4	Year 5	0 0 0 0	F () F T
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 0 71,000		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify)	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3	0 Year 4	Year 5	0 0 0 0	F 5 F
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 71,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify)	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3	0 Year 4	Year 5	0 0 0 0 0	F C F T 5
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 71,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total Ongoing Revenue Costs	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3 0	0 Year 4 0	Year 5	0 0 0 0 0	F ()
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 71,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total Ongoing Revenue Costs c.Projected Gross Revenue Benefts/	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3 0	0 Year 4 0	Year 5	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	F マ F で 6 の の
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 71,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total Ongoing Revenue Costs	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3 0	0 Year 4 0	Year 5	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	F し F て 6 の の の
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 71,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total Ongoing Revenue Costs c.Projected Gross Revenue Benefts/ Savings Income	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3 0	0 Year 4 0	Year 5	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	다 다 5 6 1/1
	0 2,681,696 198,000 0 150,000 0 0 0 0 71,000 0		a.One - Off Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total One- Off Revenue Costs b.Ongoing Revenue Costs (Specify) (Specify) (Specify) Total Ongoing Revenue Costs c.Projected Gross Revenue Benefts/ Savings	Year 1	Year 2	0 Year 3 0	0 Year 4 0	Year 5	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	F し F て 6 の の の

0

Year 1

0

Year 2

2. Capital Costs

	<u>£'000</u>							
	0	0	0	0	0		Est.	
A Expenditure Type	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	Type *	
Capital Costs								
Land Acquisition			142,500			142,500		
Building Acquisition						0		
Construction/ Conversion			660,389	2,021,307		2,681,696		
Professional Fees			198,000			198,000		
Vehicles						0		
Plant & Equipment						0		
Furniture				150,000		150,000		
IT Hardware						0		
Software & Licences						0		
Capital Grant to 3rd Parties						0		
Credit Arrangements						0		
Capitalisation of Internal Salaries			26,000	45,000		71,000		
Other (Specify)						0		
Total Capital Costs			<u>1.026,889</u>	2,216,307		3,243,196		

* S= Spot Estimate, D= Detailed Estimate, T= Tender Price.

Total Gross Revenue Benefits 0 d. MRP and Interest

B Sources of Funding

d. MRP and Interest						
MRP	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interest	0	0	0	0	0	0

ŀ

Total

£'000

0

Year 4

0

Year 5

0

Year 3

Appendix C – 13 August 2013 Executive