## REVENUE BUDGET \& CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING AS AT $31^{\text {st }}$ MARCH 2017

## Purpose of the Report

1. This report provides the Financial Outturn statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme. The first section covers Revenue Budget Monitoring. The Capital Programme is reported from paragraph 27.

## REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING

## Summary

2. The Council finished the year with an overspend of $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$.
3. The outturn by Portfolio is summarised in the table below:

| Portfolio | Outturn <br> $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | Budget <br> $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | Variance <br> $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CYPF | 83,020 | 76,675 | 6,345 |
| COMMUNITIES | 155,429 | 148,828 | 6,601 |
| PLACE | 153,848 | 154,380 | $(532)$ |
| POLICY, PERFORMANCE \& COMMUNICATION | 3,456 | 3,097 | 359 |
| RESOURCES | 52,325 | 54,222 | $(1,897)$ |
| CORPORATE | $(445,752)$ | $(437,202)$ | $(8,550)$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{2 , 3 2 6}$ | - | $\mathbf{2 , 3 2 6}$ |

4. In terms of the outturn position of $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ overspend, the key reasons are:

- Children, Young People and Families are reporting an outturn overspend of $£ 6.4 \mathrm{~m}$. This is principally due to overspends of $£ 4.2 \mathrm{~m}$ due to demand pressures for placements, $£ 1.2 \mathrm{~m}$ due to pressures on staffing budgets, transport costs and legal fees within Fieldwork Services and $£ 0.6 \mathrm{~m}$ due to a delay in savings and an increase in demand relating to Short Breaks and Direct payments.
- Communities are reporting an outturn overspend of $£ 6.6 \mathrm{~m}$. There are a number of significant overspends that comprise this figure, including but not limited to $£ 5.1 \mathrm{~m}$ of costs within Learning Disabilities Purchasing, £2.7m in Mental Health Commissioning, and $£ 1.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in Long Term Support, partially compensated for by underspends in other areas. The portfolio budget has been subject to sizeable pressures in 2016/17 and there are significant issues driving the financial
performance, as well as areas where savings have been achieved to mitigate the above pressures. Appendix 1 describes these issues in greater detail.
- Place are showing a full year underspend of $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$. This underspend is largely made up of income higher than budgeted relating to property disposals and commercial rent income within the Sheffield Retail Quarter development. This income is then offset by a shortfall in planned savings of $£ 1.3 \mathrm{~m}$ counterbalanced by other contract cost reductions of $£ 0.9 \mathrm{~m}$ and additional planning fee income of $£ 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$.
- Resources are showing a reduction in spending of $£ 1.9 \mathrm{~m}$. The key reasons for this are reductions in spend of $£ 1.1 \mathrm{~m}$ due to the outcomes of Government fraud initiatives and overpayments generated, an increase in cashable savings of $£ 0.6 \mathrm{~m}$ and reduced former employee pension costs $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$. These underspends are offset by overspends due to savings and internal income not being achieved of $£ 0.4 \mathrm{~m}$, and additional costs of $£ 0.8 \mathrm{~m}$ caused by the delay in the replacement financial system.
- Policy, Performance \& Communication are showing an overspend of $£ 359$ k, due to a shortfall in the anticipated income from the new advertising contract.
- Corporate are reporting an $£ 8.6 \mathrm{~m}$ underspend. This underspend is due to release of $£ 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ from the Better Care Fund contingency to relieve pressure on the Mental Health budget, a $£ 3.3 \mathrm{~m}$ underspend on the Corporate Redundancy budget due to lower than anticipated VER/VS applications, a $£ 2.9 \mathrm{~m}$ reduction in borrowing costs as a result of an increase in cash balances available for investment, $£ 0.8 \mathrm{~m}$ late award of the Business Rates Reconciliation Grants, the use of $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ of Social Care reserves, and the release of $£ 0.9 \mathrm{~m}$ corporate contingencies set aside for potential city centre redevelopment costs. In addition, an anticipated $£ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$ budgeted pressure relating to the Independent Living Fund did not materialise in 2016/17.
- These underspends offset an overspend of $£ 5.8 \mathrm{~m}$, which is due to a shortfall in the Better Care Fund (BCF). We and the CCG agreed when the BCF was set up that $£ 9.3 \mathrm{~m}$ of funds would be made available in total by the two partners. The NHS would fund $£ 5 \mathrm{~m}$, and the Council would fund $£ 4.3 \mathrm{~m}$ as a one-off in 2015/16, with the aim that the BCF would identify savings to eliminate the need for this contribution after 2015/16, or the CCG would identify a source of funds for it. However a slippage in this approach has occurred without the underlying savings emerging on a joint budget of $£ 280 \mathrm{~m}$. SCC is the junior financial partner in this arrangement. Consequently, only $£ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ of the $£ 5 \mathrm{~m}$ due from the CCG was received during 2016/17 and hence the overspend position.

5. Full details of all reductions in spend and overspends within Portfolios are detailed in Appendix 1.
6. Movements from initial forecasts at month 3

- The forecast outturn shows an improving position from the $£ 17.6 \mathrm{~m}$ forecast potential overspend reported in month 3 to the $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ overspend at outturn. This improvement reflects Portfolios' attempts to reduce spending, releases of Corporate reserves, and other positive Corporate movements, as described above, which have helped offset the significant pressures within the Communities and CYPF portfolios. The position month by month is shown in the following chart:



## Public Health

7. The Public Health ring-fenced grant is showing a $£ 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ reduction in expenditure against the original approved budget. Further details of the outturn position on Public Health are reported in Appendix 2.

## Housing Revenue Account

8. The 2016-17 budget is based on an assumed in year surplus position of $£ 13.0 \mathrm{~m}$ which is to be used to fund the ongoing HRA Capital Investment Programme. In accordance with the HRA's financial strategy any further in- year funds generated by the account will be used to provide further funding for the future HRA Capital Investment programme.
9. As at month 12 the full year outturn position is a $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ overall improvement from budget. Further details of the Housing Revenue Account can be found in Appendix 3.

## Unearmarked and earmarked Reserves

10. Within the existing statutory and regulatory framework, it is the responsibility of the Interim Executive Director of Resources to ensure that the Council has an adequate level of reserves and that there are clear protocols for their establishment and use.
11. Work on the reserves balances as at 31 March 2017 is still being undertaken and is dependent on the completion of the statement of accounts. However, the estimated balance of revenue reserves as at 31 March 2017 is $£ 135.5 \mathrm{~m}$, mainly comprised of earmarked reserves. These balances are shown in Appendix 4.
12. Included in the total is a figure of $£ 9.7 \mathrm{~m}$ or $2.4 \%$ of net revenue expenditure for unearmarked reserves. These unearmarked reserves have fallen below the minimum prudent level recommended by the Executive Director of Resources, mainly as a result of the $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ overspend in 2016/17. The Executive Director formally recommends, as Statutory Finance Officer (s151 Officer) that the reserve is returned to the minimum recommended level of $£ 12.6 \mathrm{~m}$, approximately $3 \%$ of net revenue expenditure, during 2017/18.
13. As referenced in the Month 9 budget monitoring report which was presented to Cabinet on 15 February 2017, it is proposed that $£ 2.9 \mathrm{~m}$ of the uncommitted New Homes Bonus reserve be un-earmarked and transferred to the General Fund balance to achieve the recommended position. However, as stated in the aforementioned report, the Council is committed to developing a Growth Investment Fund (GIF) to invest in projects that promote economic and housing growth. Whilst the use of NHB would reduce the funds available for the GIF, the Executive Director of Resources is confident that the Council will continue to be able to maintain its focus on growth.
14. Earmarked reserves are set aside to meet known or predicted future liabilities, such as Business Rates Appeals. These liabilities mean that the earmarked reserves are not normally available to fund the budget.
15. Earmarked reserves also exist because of the need to smooth the significant payments made on programmes such as the Major Sporting Facilities (MSF) and PFI schemes over the 20 year plus terms of the underlying agreements. In both cases we currently have a temporary surplus. However, over time this position will change, and future payments will be higher than our resources, so the reserves will be needed to support their primary purpose.
16. During $2016 / 17 £ 65.1 \mathrm{~m}$ was used temporarily to support the Pension Deficit early payment enabling the delivery of $£ 5 m$ of savings over the period 2017/18 to 2019/20. These funds will be fully repaid by 2019/20. This utilisation of temporary balances can be seen in a number of the earmarked reserves movements for 2016/17 in Appendix 4 attached.
17. Further details on reserves and their use can be found in Appendix 4.

## Insurance Funds

18. An independent review of the Insurance Account has been undertaken to identify the level of fund required. This includes:

- Known outstanding liabilities;
- Incurred but not reported liabilities (IBNR);
- Claims previously paid by Municipal Mutual Insurance (one of the Council's Insurers who went in to a form of receivership in the 1990's);
- Emerging claims;
- Uninsured asbestos related claims.

19. The Directors of MMI 'triggered' the scheme of arrangement under section 425 of the Companies Act 1985 (now section 899 of the Companies Act 2006). Ernst Young are now responsible for the management of the MMI's business, affairs and assets in accordance with the terms of the Scheme.
20. The Scheme provides that following the occurrence of a Trigger Event, a levy may be imposed on all those scheme creditors which, since the record date, have paid an amount or amounts in respect of established scheme liabilities which, together with the amount of elective defence costs paid by MMI on its behalf, exceeding £50,000 in aggregate. Additionally, payments made after the imposition of a Levy in respect of established scheme creditors will be made at a reduced rate (the payment percentage). Ernst Young have carried out a review of assets and liabilities of MMI and to date a levy of $25 \%$ has been paid. The levy will continue to be reviewed at least once every 12 months.
21. The Council currently has a potential claw back of $£ 3.7 \mathrm{~m}$ with MMI and $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ relating to South Yorkshire Residuary Body (SYRB).
22. The Insurance Account as at 31 March 2017 stands at $£ 21.3 \mathrm{~m}$; outstanding liabilities as at 31 March 2017 are $£ 23.5 \mathrm{~m}$. The Insurance Account is therefore $91 \%$ funded as at 31 March 2017.

## Corporate Risk Register

23. The Council maintains a Corporate Financial Risk Register which details the key financial risks facing the Council at a given point in time. The most significant risks are summarised in Appendix 5 along with any actions being undertaken to manage each of the risks.

## Annual Treasury Management Review

24. The Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual treasury review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2016/17. This review is needed to meet the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code). During 2016/17 the Full Council received the Annual Treasury Strategy, whilst Cabinet were presented with the Outturn Report. Reports were also taken to the Cabinet Member for Finance during the year.
25. The regulatory environment places responsibility on Members for the review and scrutiny of treasury management policy and activities. This report is therefore important in that respect, as it provides details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlights compliance with the Council's policies previously approved by Members.
26. The Annual Treasury Management Review is attached as Appendix 6.

## Capital Summary

27. The Capital Outturn for $2016 / 17$ is $£ 26.5 \mathrm{~m}(11 \%)$ below the approved Capital Programme. Project managers delivered a capital programme of $£ 215.4 \mathrm{~m}$ against an approved budget of $£ 241.9 \mathrm{~m}$. This is $£ 3.4 \mathrm{~m}$ lower than the Outturn forecast in Month 10.
28. Further details of the Capital Programme monitoring and projects for approval are reported in Appendices 8 to 8.6.

## Implications of this Report

## Financial implications

29. The primary purpose of this report is to provide Members with information on the City Council's Budget Monitoring position for 2016/17, and as such it does not make any recommendations that have additional financial implications for the City Council.

## Equal opportunities implications

30. There are no specific equal opportunity implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

## Legal implications

31. There are no specific legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

## Property implications

32. Although this report deals, in part, with the Capital Programme, it does not, in itself, contain any property implications, nor are there any arising from the recommendations in this report.

## Recommendations

33. Members are asked to:
(a) Note the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the 2016/17 Revenue Budget Outturn.
(b) Review and consider for approval the Business Case submission contained in Appendix 7.
(c) Note the recommendation of the Executive Director of Resources that, as Statutory Finance Officer (s151 Officer), the reserve is returned to the minimum recommended level of $£ 12.6 \mathrm{~m}$ or approximately $3 \%$ of net revenue expenditure during 2017/18.
(d) Approve the proposal to un-earmark and transfer £2.9m of the uncommitted New Homes Bonus reserve to the General Fund balance to achieve the recommended position.
(e) In relation to the Capital Programme:
i. Approve the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 8.1, including the procurement strategies, and delegate authority to the Interim Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated officer, as appropriate, to:

- award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group and;
- determine procurement strategies in relation to the S106 Parks Programme Additional Agreements;
ii. Approve the capital grant award detailed in Appendix 8.3;
iii. Approve the acceptance of the grant with the conditions detailed on Appendix 8.4;
iv. Approve the slippage and budget variations resulting from financial year end closure procedures as detailed in Appendix 8.6.

And note:
v. the outturn position on the Capital Programme; and
vi. the variation authorised by directors under the delegated authority provisions.

## Reasons for Recommendations

34. To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the capital programme in line with latest information.

## Alternative options considered

35. A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

## Dave Phillips

Head of Strategic Finance

# PORTFOLIO REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING <br> AS AT 31 MARCH 2016 

## Children Young People and Families (CYPF)

## Summary

1. As at month 12 the Portfolio has a full year outturn of an overspend of $£ 6.4$ million. The key reasons for the outturn position are:

- Business Strategy - $£ 60 k$ overspend, the key reasons are reduction in spend in catering due to the release of a provision for $£ 234 \mathrm{k}$ which is no longer required, this has been offset by an overspend of $£ 219 \mathrm{k}$ on Transport, due to increased demand and increased costs.
- Children and Families - £6.5million overspend, the key reasons are:
- Fieldwork Services - an overspend of $£ 1.2 \mathrm{~m}$, this is mainly due to an overspend on fieldwork staffing budgets of $£ 161 \mathrm{k}$, due to pressures on social workers and an increase in the number of caseloads, the planned tapering down model of social workers has been delayed and a number of temporary staff have been recruited to meet this increase in demand, however the service is experiencing difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff, which has reduced the overspend. £693k overspend on non-staffing budgets, due to increased transport costs and contact time for Children in Care. £248k overspend on legal fees, due to an increase in the number of cases.
- Health Strategy - an overspend of $£ 629 k$ on Short Break and Direct Payments, due to the delay in anticipated savings due in year and an increase in demand this year.
- Provider Services - an overspend of $£ 265 k$, due to delays in anticipated savings on integrated residential and disability services with health, due in year.
- Early Intervention and Prevention - an overspend of $£ 368 \mathrm{k}$ due to anticipated savings of $£ 200$ k on uncommitted contracts and savings in-year on legal fees, offset by a reduced expected contribution of $£ 750 \mathrm{k}$ from the CCG, leaving a net overspend of $£ 368 \mathrm{k}$.
- Placements - overspend of $£ 4.2 \mathrm{~m}$, due to increase in demand, especially in high cost placements. Also includes $£ 250$ k overspend due to a reduction in the expected contribution from the CCG.
- Inclusion and Learning Service - A reduction in spend of £249k which is a number of small underspends across the service.
- Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities - An overspend of $£ 49 \mathrm{k}$, which is due to a number of overspends across the service.

Financial Results

| Service | Outturn <br> £000s | Budget <br> $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | Variance <br> $£ 000 s$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BUSINESS STRATEGY | 2,291 | 2,231 | 60 |
| CHILDREN \& FAMILIES | 69,588 | 63,103 | 6,485 |
| INCLUSION \& LEARNING SERVICES | 2,487 | 2,736 | $(249)$ |
| LIFELONG LEARN, SKILL \& COMMUN | 8,654 | 8,605 | 49 |
| GRAND TOTAL | $\mathbf{8 3 , 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 , 6 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 3 4 5}$ |

## DSG

2. The following is a summary of the position on DSG budgets at month 12 :

|  | Month 12 <br> $£ 000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Business Strategy | 477 |
| Children and Families | 222 |
| Inclusion and Learning Services | 706 |
| Lifelong Learning, Skills and <br> Communities | 346 |
|  | $\mathbf{1 , 7 5 1}$ |

## DSG Commentary

3. As at month 12 the Portfolio has a full year outturn of an overspend of $£ 1.8$ million on DSG. The key reasons for the outturn position are:

- Business Strategy - £477k overspend, the key reasons are an overspend of £507k on Transport, due to increased demand and increased costs and an overspend of $£ 350 \mathrm{k}$ on the special school contingency, due to additional special school places. These have been partially offset by a reduction in spend on pension costs of $£ 205 \mathrm{k}$ and increased income of $£ 178 \mathrm{k}$ in Central Support costs.
- Children and Families - £222k overspend, the key reasons are an overspend in Gibson House of $£ 196 \mathrm{k}$ due to an overspend on agency staff and an overspend of $£ 133 \mathrm{k}$ on Children With Disabilities placements, due to a reduction in the contribution from Health for joint cases. These have been partially offset by small underspends in other areas of the service.
- Inclusion and Learning Service - An overspend of $£ 706$ k, this includes $£ 900$ k overspend on SEN placement budgets, this is due to the full year impact of a number of high cost placements made in 2015/16 and an increase in the number of placements during 2016/17. The overspend also includes $£ 306 \mathrm{k}$ overspend due to delays in the anticipated savings for the redesign of education services. These have been partially offset by small underspends in other areas of the service.
- Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities - An overspend of $£ 346 \mathrm{k}$, this is due to an overspend of $£ 340 \mathrm{k}$ in Post 16 High Needs due to an increase in demand for placements at colleges and additional learners at Sheaf.


## Communities Portfolio

## Summary

4. As at year end, the Portfolio is forecasting a full year outturn of an over spend of $£ 6.6 \mathrm{~m}$. The key reasons for the outturn position are:

## Performance, Information and Planning (under spend of $£ 576 k$ ):

- The under spend position for PIPS is mainly due to the pay award budget (net of overspends) of $£ 369 \mathrm{k}$ which is held in Executive. There are under spends against mail and insurance budget $£ 195 k$ and net staffing underspends in Performance \& Planning \& Quality of £167k. IT costs are overspent by £103k (including the LTS Total Mobile costs). There are other net pay and non-pay under spends of $£ 47 \mathrm{k}$ across the rest of PIPS as well as additional staffing over spends in business support of $£ 99 \mathrm{k}$.


## Care \& Support (over spend of $£ 5.1 \mathrm{~m}$ ):

- Access, Prevention and Reablement forecasts an over spend of $£ 269 k$ due to spend on agency staff across the teams.
- Learning Disabilities returned an outturn of $£ 4.7 \mathrm{~m}$ over spend. This is made up of:-
- Purchasing LD is forecasting an over spend of $£ 5.1 \mathrm{~m}$. This is a $£ 1.4 \mathrm{~m}$ pressure from 15-16 together with $£ 5.8 \mathrm{~m}$ new client costs (new packages and increases to existing packages) that have emerged in 2016-17, offset by reductions and savings made to date of $£ 2.1 \mathrm{~m}$.
- LD Assessment and Care Management is forecasting an over spend of $£ 334 \mathrm{k}$ due to full year cost of additional review teams. A proportion of the total cost of these teams is now set against existing budget due to vacancies in the establishment which has reduced the over spend.
- LD Provider services is forecasting an under spend of $£ 709 \mathrm{k}$ due to reductions in client hours as a result of a movement of clients from inhouse services to independent provision (hours moved to purchasing budget) and the subsequent reduction in use of agency staff and bank staff.
- Long Term Support is showing an over spend of $£ 1.2 \mathrm{~m}$. This comprises the net position of an over spend in adults purchasing of $£ 1.8 \mathrm{~m}$, with an under spend on Adaptations, Housing and Health budgets of $£ 94 \mathrm{k}$ and Case Management staff of $£ 452 \mathrm{k}$.
- Safeguarding Services are reporting an under spend of $£ 65 \mathrm{k}$ as a result of nonpay/supplies and services under spends in the MCA Team and the Deprivation of Liberty budget.
- Provider Services is reporting an under spend against budget of $£ 226 \mathrm{k}$. The under spend is due to a $£ 311 \mathrm{k}$ reduction in spend on Carers in the Adult Placement Shared Lives Service and under spends on salaries against Community Support Services $£ 101 \mathrm{k}$. This is offset by a reported over spend against City Wide Care Alarms £288k as a result of lower income than budgeted. Reablement Services report a position which is almost balanced to budget as a result of drawdown of $£ 180 \mathrm{k}$ of corporate funding to cover salary costs until full implementation of the MER.
- Contributions to Care has an under spend position of $£ 831 \mathrm{k}$ against budget. This figure is made up of over achievements of income in Integrated Charge Income $£ 773$ k and Residential Income of $£ 780$ k netted down by over spends against SCAS staffing of $£ 95 \mathrm{k}$ due to additional staffing recruited to work on Appointeeships, $£ 44 \mathrm{k}$ on Health contributions to Direct Payments and under achievements of $£ 72 \mathrm{k}$ in Property Income and in CHC income of $£ 508 \mathrm{k}$.
- Practice Development is a forecast to under spend by $£ 49 \mathrm{k}$ due to budget moving for vacant posts.


## Commissioning (over spend of $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ ):

- An under spend of $£ 595 \mathrm{k}$ is reported by Commissioned Housing which is mainly due to a delay in implementation of new Housing Related Support Contracts coupled with annualised contracted savings and a small staff saving.
- An over spend against Commissioned Mental Health Services of $£ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$. This is made up of a $£ 3.2 \mathrm{~m}$ over spend in Mental Health purchasing and $£ 449 \mathrm{k}$ over spend in the S75 Mental Health contract offset by forecast under spends on the Older People Mental Health contract of $£ 773 \mathrm{k}$ and the Partnership and Grant Aid budget of £143k. Negotiations with the Care Trust have finalised for 16/17 activity at $£ 450 \mathrm{k}$ above budget; discussions have begun to minimise the level of
over spend in 17-18. There is an on-going conversation with the CCG to enable joint planning to be done in order to bring the over spend down next year.
- An over spend on Public Health Drug and Alcohol (DACT) of £140k. The majority of this is due to a forecast over spend on Contract Drug costs $£ 107 \mathrm{k}$, NonContract Treatment costs of $£ 24 \mathrm{k}$ and minor over spends against Alcohol Programme £8k.
- Social Care Commissioning Service forecasts an over spend of $£ 123 \mathrm{k}$. There is a forecast over spend of $£ 238 \mathrm{k}$ on the British Red Cross contract for Independent Living Solutions (ILS) along with an additional £19k increase in Communities Wellbeing Programme People Keeping Well (PKW) previously held in Care and Support now transferred to Commissioning. This is partly offset by an under spend on staffing against ILS $£ 15 \mathrm{k}$ and Commissioning Leadership team of $£ 71 \mathrm{k}$


## Community Services (over spend of $£ 38 \mathbf{k}$ ):

- Library Services are forecast $£ 94 \mathrm{k}$ under spend. This is made up of the Heritage Team £21k under spend as a result of increase in archiving income, Hub \& Home Libraries $£ 53 \mathrm{k}$ due to reduction in pay spend and rent income from Housing. Central \& Collections £43k mainly due to reduced salary costs and non-pay spends. These are offset by over spends against Leadership team $£ 20 \mathrm{k}$ due to unfunded pay costs. Service Development are reporting an overspend of $£ 15 \mathrm{k}$ mainly due to a shortfall in forecast in the World Metal Index income of $£ 56 \mathrm{k}$ as a result of the planned closure of the service along with other minor over spends on IT Charges in Service Development offset by under spends on standby budget and supplies and services. Associate and Codelivered Libraries report a $£ 10 \mathrm{k}$ under spend, mainly over recovery on income.
- Locality Management is forecasting an over spend of $£ 112 \mathrm{k}$. Voluntary Sector overspend of $£ 158 \mathrm{k}$ mainly as a result of unachieved savings from the 15-16 target, Health and Social Care Integration approved salary over spends and loss of STH income. There is a $£ 39 \mathrm{k}$ reduction in pay spend in Right First Time team. Locality Area pay budgets report an under spend of $£ 7 \mathrm{k}$.
- Public Health staffing budgets are over spent by £20k as a result of slight delay in implementation of the MER.


## Housing General Fund (under spend of $£ 267 k$ )

The under spend in Housing General Fund is mainly due to:

- City Wide Housing Services (CWHS) £392k under spend due to low uptake of small grants in Local Assistance Scheme, savings on staffing and higher than anticipated income.
- Business Planning $£ 23 k$ over spend resulting from staffing costs where there was no funding.
- Neighbourhood Intervention and Support (NITS) £374k under spend mainly as a result of higher than anticipated income and savings on staffing costs relating to Housing+ MER.
- Sustainable City $£ 476$ k over spend due to $£ 181 \mathrm{k}$ legal fees, £195k VER / pensions costs for which there are no budgets plus an historical negative cash limit of $£ 113 \mathrm{k}$. These are offset by minor staffing/supplies underspends of $£ 13 \mathrm{k}$.

Financial Results

| Service | Outturn <br> £000s | Budget <br> £000s | Variance <br> $£ 000 s$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PIPS | 7,182 | 7,758 | $(576)$ |
| CARE AND SUPPORT | 109,781 | 104,698 | 5,083 |
| COMMISSIONING | 27,306 | 24,982 | 2,324 |
| COMMUNITY SERVICES | 7,534 | 7,496 | 38 |
| HOUSING GENERAL FUND | 3,627 | 3,894 | $(267)$ |
| GRAND TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 5 5 , 4 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8 , 8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 6 0 1}$ |

## Place Portfolio

## Summary

5. Place Portfolio’s 2016-17 revenue outturn is $£ 532 \mathrm{k}$ under budget.

## Financial Results

| Service | Outturn <br> $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | Budget <br> $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | Variance <br> $£ 000 s$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BUSINESS STRATEGY \& REGULATION | 33,828 | 34,491 | $(663)$ |
| CREATIVE SHEFFIELD | 3,203 | 3,113 | 90 |
| CULTURE \& ENVIRONMENT | 32,029 | 32,143 | $(114)$ |
| DEVELOPMENT SERVICES | 84,788 | 84,633 | 155 |
| GRAND TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 5 3 , 8 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 4 , 3 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{( 5 3 2 )}$ |

## Commentary

6. The key variances ( $>£ 100 \mathrm{k}$ ) within the provisional outturn are outlined below.

## Business Strategy \& Regulation

7. The provisional revenue out-turn was $£ 663 \mathrm{k}$ under budget and the improvement was largely attributable to fees from property disposals and increased commercial rent income in the properties acquired for the development of the Sheffield Retail Quarter.

## Culture \& Environment

8. The provisional revenue out-turn was $£ 114 \mathrm{k}$ under budget and was largely attributable to three factors:

- income in Bereavement Services being higher than budget $£ 300 \mathrm{k}$;
- reduced capital charges in respect of the new sports facilities at Graves and North Active leisure centres due to the slightly later opening dates £200k; and
- losses in the Markets service due to lower letting levels $£ 400 \mathrm{k}$.


## Development Services

9. The provisional revenue out-turn was £155k over budget. This was the result of a shortfall in planned savings within Streets Ahead and Parking services $£ 1.3 \mathrm{~m}$, which continue to be progressed with a view to implementation in the early part of the 2017-18 financial year, largely offset by other contract cost reductions $£ 901 \mathrm{k}$ and additional income from Planning fees $£ 259$ k.

## Resources Portfolio

## Summary

10. As at month 12 the outturn position for the Portfolio is a reduction in expenditure of $£ 1.9 \mathrm{~m}$. The key reasons for the outturn position are:

- An over spend on Customer Services has arisen due to savings and internal income not being achieved and these are being addressed in 2017/18 budget planning. The insourced Revs and Bens business units has accounted for some of the over spend as staffing resource has been required to meet KPI targets, and integrate into the service.
- An over spend of $£ 762 \mathrm{k}$ on Finance due to inclusion of additional costs arising from the implementation delay in the ReFine Programme. This was a planned over spend offset by ear-marked under spends on Commercial Services.

Offset by:

- A reduction in spend of $£ 410 \mathrm{k}$ on Commercial Services mainly due to employee savings through vacancy management and additional recharge income.
- An increase in cashable savings of $£ 623 \mathrm{k}$ on Commercial Services (Savings) due to confirmation and re-profiling of all the Early Payment Discounts and Project Savings.
- A reduction in spend of $£ 368 \mathrm{k}$ on Human Resources due mainly to the over recovery of income in relation to Project Support charges and under spends on employees.
- A reduction in expenditure of $£ 159 k$ on Legal Services due in part to staff vacancies $£ 132 \mathrm{k}$ and under spends within Democratic Services and Member Services of $£ 39 \mathrm{k}$ across supplies and services.
- A reduction in spend of $£ 461 \mathrm{k}$ on Central Costs due mainly from reduced numbers requiring funding in relation to Former Employee Pensions.
- A reduction in spend of $£ 1.1 \mathrm{~m}$ on Housing Benefit in large part due to the outcomes of Government fraud initiatives and overpayments generated.


## Financial Results

| Service | Outturn | Budget | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| BUSINESS CHANGE \& INFORMATION SOLUTIONS | $(8,125)$ | $(8,158)$ | 33 |
| COMMERCIAL SERVICES | (30) | 380 | (410) |
| COMMERCIAL SERVICES (SAVINGS) | $(2,721)$ | $(2,098)$ | (623) |
| CUSTOMER SERVICES | 4,846 | 4,453 | 393 |
| FINANCE | 4,130 | 3,368 | 762 |
| HUMAN RESOURCES | (155) | 213 | (368) |
| LEGAL SERVICES | 3,228 | 3,387 | (159) |
| RESOURCES MANAGEMENT \& PLANNING | 183 | 191 | (8) |
| TRANSPORT AND FACILITIES MGT | 29,548 | 29,548 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 30,904 | 31,284 | (380) |
| CENTRAL COSTS | 22,071 | 22,532 | (461) |
| HOUSING BENEFIT | (650) | 406 | $(1,056)$ |
| GRAND TOTAL | 52,325 | 54,222 | $(1,897)$ |

## Policy, Performance and Communications Portfolio Summary

11. As at month 12 the outturn position for the Portfolio was an over spend of $£ 359 \mathrm{k}$. The key reasons for the outturn position are:

- A $£ 359 k$ over spend due to an underlying in-year shortfall in the anticipated income from the new advertising contracts.


## Financial Results

| Service | Outturn | Budget | Variance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $£ \mathbf{£ 0 0 0 s}$ | $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ |
| ACCOUNTABLE BODY ORGANISATIONS | $(199)$ | $(199)$ | $(0)$ |
| POLICY, PERFORMANCE \& |  |  |  |
| COMMUNICATION | 3,695 | 3,336 | 359 |
| PUBLIC HEALTH | $(40)$ | $(40)$ | 0 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 3,456 | 3,097 | 359 |

## Corporate

## Summary

12. The Corporate portfolio displays an outturn position of $£ 8.5 \mathrm{~m}$ underspend.

- Corporate Expenditure: Corporate wide budgets that are not allocated to individual services / portfolios, including capital financing costs and the provision for redundancy / severance costs.
- Corporate income: Revenue Support Grant, locally retained business rates and Council tax income, some specific grant income and contributions to/from reserves.


## Financial Results

13. The table below shows the items which are classified as Corporate and which include:

| Service | Outturn | Budget | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | $£ 000 \mathbf{s}$ | $£ 00 \mathbf{s}$ | $£ 00 \mathbf{s}$ |
| CONSOLIDATED LOANS FUND | 30,274 | 33,157 | $(2,883)$ |
| CORPORATE TRANSACTIONS | $(476,024)$ | $(470,358)$ | $(5,666)$ |
| GRAND TOTAL | $(445,752)$ | $(437,201)$ | $(8,549)$ |
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## PUBLIC HEALTH BUDGET MONITORING AS AT

## 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ March 2017

## Purpose of the Report

1. To report on the $2016 / 17$ Public Health grant spend across the Council for the month ending $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2017.
2. The report provides details of the full year spend of Public Health grant compared to budget.
3. The net reported position for each portfolio/service area would normally be zero as public health spend is matched by a draw down of public health grant. For the purposes of this report, and in order to identify where corrective action may be necessary, we have shown actual expenditure compared to budget where there is an underspend position.

## Summary

4. At month 12 the overall position was an underspend of ( $£ 721 \mathrm{k}$ ) which is summarised in the table below.

|  | Forecast Full <br> Year <br> Expenditure | Full Year <br> Expenditure <br> Budget | Full Year <br> Variance <br> as at <br> M12 | Full Year <br> Variance <br> as at <br> M11 | Movement <br> from Prior <br> Month |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CYPF | 17,945 | 17,981 | -36 | -34 | -2 |
| COMMUNITIES | 13,009 | 13,009 | 0 | -182 | 182 |
| PLACE | 2,654 | 2,798 | -144 | -133 | -11 |
| DIRECTOR OF PH | 1,622 | 2,163 | -541 | -391 | -150 |
| Total | 35,230 | 35,951 | -721 | -740 | 19 |

5. Key reasons for the forecast under spend are:

- (£36k) underspend in CYP due to $£ 24 k$ fee recoupment from Health. Remaining underspend as a result of vacancies / maternity leave.
- Communites to budget.
- (£144k) underspend in Place mainly due to vacancies and maternity leave
- ( $£ 541 \mathrm{k})$ underspend of $£ 541 \mathrm{k}$ in DPH mainly as a result of vacancies on staffing and underspends on payments to health agencies and support services, as well as lower expenditure than forecast on GP health clinics.

6. Key Reason for significant month on month changes are:

- $£ 182 \mathrm{k}$ deterioration in Communities is a result of the full public health budget being drawn down. The Commmunities position was previously underspent by $£ 182 \mathrm{k}$ as a result of reduced spend on Mental Health Contracts and vacancies.
- (£150k) improvement in Director of PH is due to not previously forecast staffing vacancies and lower than forecast spend on GP health clinics for the Q4 payments, and for payments to support services.


## Communities Portfolio

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## HRA Revenue Budget Monitoring 2016/17- as at March

## Purpose of this Report

1. To provide a summary report on the HRA 2016/2017 revenue budget for the month ending 31 March 2017, and agree any actions necessary.
2. The content of this report will be used as the basis of the content of the budget monitoring report to the Executive Management Team and to Members.

## Summary

3. The HRA Business Plan is based on the principle of ensuring that investment and services required for council housing is met by income raised in the HRA.
4. The HRA income and expenditure account provides a budgeted contribution towards funding the HRA capital investment programme. As at month 12 the full year outturn position is an overall improvement of $£ 2.3 \mathrm{~m}$ from this budgeted position. As such the funding contribution to capital investment programme will be revised to take this improvement into account. This is in line the HRA Business Plan which sets out the Council's plans and priorities for investment in Council housing over the next five years. Capital investment continues to be made on improving Council housing with the focus on new roofs and improvements to communal areas, as well as building new council housing.
5. The main areas contributing to the outturn position include a net increase in income of $£ 478 \mathrm{k}$ primarily as a result of a reduced level of bad debt provision offset by a higher turnover of vacant properties; a reduction in other income of $£ 76 \mathrm{k}$ due to revised interest on cash flow offset by an increase in service charge income; $£ 63 k$ overspend on repairs and maintenance; and a lower than anticipated depreciation charge of $£ 675 \mathrm{k}$. There is an overall a reduction in housing running costs of $£ 3.2 \mathrm{~m}$, of which $£ 2.5 \mathrm{~m}$ relates to savings on staffing costs / vacancies due to the restructure of the service and $£ 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ saving on other running costs. These savings are partly offset by a transfer to reserves of $£ 2.5 \mathrm{~m}$ mainly for project and other costs expected to materialise in 2017-18. Finally there is a reduction of $£ 623 \mathrm{k}$ on loan interest payments due to revised borrowing assumptions.

Financial Results

| Housing Revenue Account (excluding <br> Community Heating) | FY Outturn <br> £OOO's | FY Budget <br> $£ O 00 ' s$ | FY Variance <br> £O00's |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.NET INCOME DWELLINGS | $(147,228)$ | $(146,750)$ | $(478)$ |
| 2.OTHER INCOME | $(6,448)$ | $(6,524)$ | 76 |
| 3.HOMES-REPAIRS \& MAINTENANCE | 32,933 | 32,870 | 63 |
| 4.DEPRECIATION-CAP FUND PROG | 38,761 | 39,436 | $(675)$ |
| 5.TENANT SERVICES | 49,651 | 52,855 | $(3,204)$ |
| 6.INTEREST ON BORROWING | 14,507 | 15,130 | $(623)$ |
| 7. TRANSFER TO RESERVE | 2,521 | - | 2,521 |
| 8.CONTRIBUTION TO CAP PROG | 15,303 | 12,983 | 2,320 |

## Community Heating

6. The budgeted position for Community Heating is a draw down from Community Heating reserves of $£ 293 \mathrm{k}$. As at month 12 the position is a draw down from reserves of $£ 68 \mathrm{k}$, an improvement of $£ 225 \mathrm{k}$. This is mainly due to lower than expected usage due to the mild weather and a reduction in overall energy costs.

|  | FY <br> Outturn <br> COOO's | FY <br> Budget <br> £000's | FY <br> Variance <br> £OOO's |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Income | $(2,471)$ | $(2,723)$ | 252 |
| Expenditure | 2,539 | 3,016 | $(477)$ |
| Net | 68 | $\mathbf{2 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{( 2 2 5 )}$ |

## Housing Revenue Account Risks

7. There are a number of future risks and uncertainties that could impact on the 30 year HRA business plan. As well as the introduction of Universal Credit and changes to Housing Benefits, the Government has announced a number of further changes in the Housing and Planning Act and Welfare Reform and Work Act. These changes include a revision to social housing rent policy, which will reduce rents for the next three years. This will have a considerable impact on the resources available to the HRA. In addition, other Government and changes in relation to fixed term tenancies and levy proposals in the Housing and Planning Act will impact on both tenants and the HRA business plan. Work is continually ongoing to assess the financial impact of these. Other identified risks to the HRA are:

## Appendix 3

- Welfare Reform /Universal Credit: the Government's welfare reform continues to be a significant risk to the HRA. The risk to income collection will continue to become increasingly difficult as Universal Credit and continues to be rolled out. Mitigations are in place such as funding additional officers to manage the impacts of welfare changes on affected tenants. Work is continually ongoing analysing the financial risk to the business plan.
- Interest rates: fluctuations in the future levels of interest rates have always been recognised as a risk to the HRA. These are managed through the Council's Treasury Management Strategy.
- Repairs and Maintenance: existing and emerging risks within the revenue repairs budget include unexpected increased demand (for example due to adverse weather conditions) and future changes to contractual arrangements.

8. The HRA business plan is regularly reviewed along with expenditure plans to ensure flexibility to respond to the expected Housing and Planning Act Regulations.
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## Appendix 5

## CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

This Appendix provides a brief overview of the main financial risks facing the Council in 2016/17 and beyond. A more detailed schedule of these risks will be monitored by the Executive Management Team to ensure that the risks are mitigated.

## Corporate Risks

## 2017/18 Budget Savings \& Emerging Pressures

1. There will need to be robust monitoring in order to ensure that the level of savings required for a balanced budget in 2017/18 are achieved, especially given the cumulative impact of $£ 352 \mathrm{~m}$ of savings over the term 2011-17, and furthermore the backdrop of continuing reductions in Government grant from 2017/18 onwards.
2. Whilst preparing the budget 2017/18, officers identified numerous pressures which, if left unchecked, could lead to significant overspends in 2017/18 and beyond. The following pressures have been highlighted because they present the highest degree of uncertainty.

## Capital financing costs

3. The Council currently maintains a substantial but prudent under borrowed position to help support the revenue budget and mitigate residual counterparty default risk on cash investments. In operating with an under borrowed position the Council exposes itself to interest-rate risk. This risk is exacerbated by the uncertainty created by the EU referendum decision. Recognising this, our Treasury Management function maintain a regular dialogue with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Executive Director of Resources to monitor the risk and review mitigation opportunities.

## Business Rates

4. Following the advent of the Government's Business Rates Retention Scheme in April 2013, a substantial proportion of risk has been transferred to local government, particularly in relation to appeals, charitable relief, tax avoidance, hardship relief and negative growth.
5. There has been a concerted effort by the Valuation Office Agency to clear outstanding appeals prior to the launch of the 2017 Revaluation. However as at 31st March 2017, there were still over 1,100 properties with a rateable value of approximately $£ 170 \mathrm{~m}$ under appeal in Sheffield.
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There have been a large number of appeals lodged in the last three years relating to GP Surgeries, ATMs and Virgin Media. The decision by the Valuation Tribunal to significantly lower the rateable value of GP Surgeries, in addition to the Government announcement to move to full academisation of schools, will have a material impact on the business rates revenues collectable by Sheffield City Council in 2017/18 and beyond.
6. Not all of the $£ 170 \mathrm{~m}$ rateable value noted above is at risk and not all the appeals will be successful. However due to the uncertainty around these factors a prudent provision was taken during 2016/17 to mitigate the loss of income as a result of successful appeals. Actual trends on appeals were monitored in 2016/17, with any revised estimates of the impact of appeals forming part of the 2017/18 budget process.
7. As part of the Business Rates Retention Scheme, there is a built-in revaluation process every five years to ensure the rateable values of the properties remain accurate. This process has been delayed for 2 years but will come into effect from 1 April 2017. This has seen all hereditaments in Sheffield revalued and assigned a revised rateable value. There is the potential that there will be a large number of appeals due to this revaluation which has been taken into account when compiling the 2017/18 budget.
8. The appeals process following the 2017 Revaluation has changed and now will be known as Check, Challenge, Appeal. The aim of this system is to reduce the number of spurious and speculative appeals and reduce the time taken to process genuine appeals; however it is not known at this point how effective this new process will be.
9. The draft list for the 2017 Revaluation highlights significant changes for a number of hereditaments within the city. The overall Rateable Value of the city has remained relatively stable; however within that there are a number of increases and decrease in value.

The city's largest hereditament (in terms of rateable value) following the 2017 Revaluation is a national telecommunications provider whose appeals feature a claim that all of their hereditaments across the country should feature on one authority's list. We are having ongoing discussions with both the Valuation Office Agency and DCLG as to the likelihood of this occurring and any potential ramifications.
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## Implementation of savings proposals

10. The risk of delivering savings in 2017/18 in specific areas such as adults' and children's social care is considerable, given the increasing demand pressures and the levels of savings that have been achieved in previous years. To mitigate this, officers are working on the safe and legal implementation of budget proposals by:

- Ensuring that there is a thorough understanding of the impact of proposals on different groups and communities, including undertaking Equality Impact Assessments for budget proposals and discussed with Cabinet Members;
- Carrying out appropriate, meaningful consultation activity with affected communities and stakeholders, and ensuring that where the proposal affects a supplier or provider, that they undertake appropriate consultation and equalities work with service users; and
- Discussing budget proposals with affected members of staff in advance of them being made public, and putting in place MER processes where required, in consultation with HR.


## Medium Term Financial Position

11. On 19 October 2016, Cabinet considered a report of the Executive Director of Resources entitled Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2017/18 to 2021/22. This report provided an update of the Council's MTFS to reflect the budget decision of the Council for 2016/17 and the potential impact on the next 5 years of the Government's plans for deficit reduction. This report sets the planning scenarios for the medium term.
12. The report on the MTFS indicated that there would be ongoing reductions in Revenue Support Grant (RSG) as outlined in the December 2015 Autumn Statement, which covers the period to 2020/21. The reductions in RSG are now expected to total $£ 53.7 \mathrm{~m}$.
13. The Council's financial position is significantly determined by the level of Business Rates and Council Tax income. Each of these may be subject to considerable volatility and will require close monitoring and a focus on delivering economic growth to increase our income and on delivering outcomes jointly with other public sector bodies and partners.
14. It is worth noting that, as of 2020/21, the Council will no longer receive RSG, as part of the move towards full retention of business rates. This
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shift in financing regime underscores the risk outlined in the above paragraph.

## Pension Fund

15. Bodies whose pension liability is backed by the Council are likely to find the cost of the scheme a significant burden in the current economic context. If they become insolvent the resulting liability may involve significant cost to the Council.
16. Initial results of the triennial review for pensions which covers 2017 to 2020 highlighted the total liabilities being underwritten by the Council for external bodies is $£ 10.4 \mathrm{~m}$. It is worth noting that this figure is based upon the current estimates of the pension funds in deficit. However, should an organisation become insolvent, this liability will be crystallised and subject to a 'least risk basis' calculation. This calculation in effect would substantially increase the amount due by Sheffield City Council.
17. A review of these risks is being undertaken to ensure that any impacts of potential crystallisations are minimised.

## Economic Climate

18. There is potential for current adverse economic conditions to result in increased costs (e.g. increased homelessness cases) or reduced revenues.
19. The Council seeks to maintain adequate financial reserves to mitigate the impact of unforeseen circumstances.

## External Funding

20. The Council utilises many different grant regimes, for example central government, Sheffield City Region and EU. Delivering projects that are grant funded involves an element of risk of grant claw back where agreed terms and conditions are not stringently adhered to and evidenced by portfolios. In order to minimise risk strong project management skills and sound financial controls are required by Project Managers along with adherence to the Leader's Scheme of Delegation to approve external funding bids.
21. As SCC funding reduces, portfolios are increasingly seeking out new sources of external funding, both capital and revenue. EU funding contracts have more complex conditions, require greater evidence to substantiate expenditure claims and are less flexible on timescales and output delivery targets. This increases the inherent risk in projects which
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are EU funded. Furthermore as the Council reduces its staff resources a combination of fewer staff and less experienced staff increases the risk of non-compliance with the funding contract conditions and exposes the authority to potential financial claw back.
22. Moreover, the pressure on the General Fund means that Service Managers are forced to seek more external funding such that the general level of risk associated with grants is increasing because of the additional workload this creates amongst reduced and potentially inexperienced staff.
23. The result of the recent referendum on EU membership does not in the short term change the risk profile of EU grants.

## Treasury Management

24. The Council proactively manages counter-party risk especially since the credit crunch of 2008. Counterparty risk arises where we have cash exposure to bank and financial institutions who may default on their obligations to repay to us sums invested. Counterparty risk had diminished over the last financial year as banks have been obliged to improve their capital funding positions to mitigate against future financial shocks. However, the UK's decision to leave the European Union has the potential to intensify these risks as the UK's decision to exit the EU creates significant political, economic, legislative and market uncertainty which is unlikely to be resolved in the short term. The Council is continuing to mitigate counterparty risk through a prudent investment strategy, placing the majority of surplus cash in AAA highly liquid and diversified funds.
25. As part of the 2017/18 budget process, we developed Treasury Management and Investment Strategies, both of which were based on discussions with members and senior officers about our risk appetite. This included a review of our counter-party risk to ensure it is reflective of the relative risks present in the economy. A cautious approach was adopted whilst the uncertainties created by the exit from the EU are resolved and the level of market volatility returns to normal levels. Given the profound nature of the exit from the EU, we may need to review our Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies during 2017/18 to ensure we have the ability to respond appropriately to market volatility.
26. The Council is also actively managing its longer term need for cash. Cash flow requirements show that the Council will require new borrowing

## Appendix 5

in the coming years to finance capital investment.. The uncertainties caused by the UK exit from the EU will require the Council to remain vigilant to interest-rate risk, and will draw down loans in a timely manner to militate against borrowing costs rising above our target rates.
27. The Council is continuing its efforts to ensure full compliance with the increasingly stringent requirements of Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS). PCI DSS is a proprietary information security standard for organizations that handle branded credit cards from the major card schemes including Visa, MasterCard and American Express.
28. The Council currently has one early payment outstanding with a major supplier in return for a saving on the contract cost. There is a risk to the Council that having received payment that this company may fail to deliver the services. This is mitigated by the existing contract protections, financial evaluation of the company and parent company guarantee. Also as goods and services are delivered against these contracts, the level of exposure reduces over time.

## Welfare Reforms

29. In April 2013, the government began to introduce changes to the Welfare system which have had and will continue to have a profound effect on Sheffield residents including council taxpayers and council house tenants. The cumulative impact of these changes is significant. They include:

- The Abolition of Council Tax Benefit: replaced with a local scheme of local Council Tax Support from April 2013. The Council approved the replacement scheme, based on the reduced funding available from Government, and set up a hardship fund in January 2013, but there are risks to council tax collection levels and pressures on the hardship fund which are being closely monitored.
- Housing Benefit Changes: Since 2013 the Government has introduced, and will continue to introduce various changes to the Housing Benefit System. These changes aim to reduce the level of benefit paid and hence potentially impact on the recipient's ability to pay rent and council tax. Consequently there may be an adverse impact in the level of arrears particularly as a result of the introduction of Universal Credit.
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- Introduction of Universal Credit (UC): The roll out of UC for claimants in Sheffield started in January 2016 for new single jobseekers. Roll out to other new claimants is planned to start in July 2018. However, full migration of existing working age Housing Benefit claimants will not start until at least 2019 and is not expected to be finished until at least 2021. There are no known plans to discontinue Housing Benefit for pensioners (who make up half of our HB caseload) although arrangements for funding are under review.
- Potentially the biggest impact on the Council's finances of the introduction of UC is on the HRA and collection of rent. Support towards housing costs is currently paid through housing benefit direct to the HRA; in future this will be paid through UC direct to individuals. It is estimated that this could double or even treble the cost of collection and increase rent arrears by $£ 12 \mathrm{~m}$ by the end of 2020/21. However, impacts are uncertain at present as there is limited data available therefore estimates will be reviewed as we learn from the roll out. There will also be an impact on the current contract with Capita and internal client teams.


## Children, Young People and Families Risks

## Education Funding

30. Schools are entitled to receive a proportion of the Council's Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which schools forum have decided can be dedelegated back to CYPF to fund central services. Academies can on conversion choose whether to buy into those services thus creating a potential funding gap. Up to $£ 500 \mathrm{k}$ could be at risk to centrally funded services should Academies choose not to buy back those services funded from de-delegated DSG from the local authority.
31. If an academy is a sponsored conversion then the Council will have to bear the cost of any closing deficit balance that remains in the Council's accounts. In 2017/18 this cost to the Council is estimated at around £100k and remains a risk for any future conversions, especially with the expansion of the academy conversion programme.
32. Also as part of the Spending Review and Autumn Statement 2015, the government announced that it will introduce a national funding formula for schools, high needs and early years. The government had planned to

## Appendix 5

introduce this new funding formula from 2017/18; however, the new system will now apply from 2018/19. The government has launched a detailed consultation; further details and the financial impact for Sheffield are expected later in 2017.
33. As part of transition to a National Funding Formula, when all funding allocations to schools will be directly managed by Education Funding Agency (2019-20), Sheffield school forum is expected to review and approve all previously held centrally held allocation subject to a limitation of no new commitments or increase in expenditure over the next two years. These historical commitments are now part of central school block and school forum approval is required each year to confirm the amounts on each line. Expenditure in centrally held funding amounts to around $£ 8$ m.

## Children's Social Care

34. There is an increase in demand for services for children social care including demand for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children. A number of transformational projects have been put in place to manage the increase in demand within available resources. Implementation of these programmes is contingent upon cross service and cross portfolio working

## Communities Risks

35. In $2016 / 17$ a gap of $£ 9.3 \mathrm{~m}$ in the council's funding was bridged using $£ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ of CCG funding and council reserves. For 2017/18, the CCG contribution so far identified is $£ 5 \mathrm{~m}$. As with last year, the remainder will need to be funded from temporary sources until such time as sustainable savings proposals are developed from within the Better Care Fund in order to balance the budget for future years. Work to identify these remains ongoing.
36. Significant cost pressures were identified during 2015/16 which translated into higher demand in 2016/17 on Mental Health purchasing budgets as a result of some changes to care packages managed by the Care Trust. Whilst these changes are the right thing to do from a system wide perspective, they had a disproportionate impact on SCC. In 2017/18 it is proposed to enter a pooled budget arrangement with the Clinical Commissioning Group and manage Mental Health services jointly within the Better Care Fund and identify savings through a new joined up approach to delivering services.
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37. In 2016/17 we have seen significant increased pressures on demand for Council adult social care services which has resulted in a forecast over spend position. For 2017/18 we have put in measures to address the budget gap however the risk remains that continued demand pressures increasingly affect our position to balance.

## Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Risks

38. There are a number of future risks and uncertainties that could impact on the 30 year HRA business plan. As well as the introduction of Universal Credit and changes to Housing Benefits, the Government has announced a number of further changes in the Housing and Planning Act and Welfare Reform and Work Act. These include a revision to social housing rent policy, which will reduce rents for the next three years. This will have a considerable impact on the resources available to the HRA. In addition, other Government and changes in relation to fixed term tenancies and levy proposals in the Housing and Planning Act will impact on both tenants and the HRA business plan. Work is continually ongoing to assess the financial impact of these. Other identified risks to the HRA are:

- Interest rates: fluctuations in the future levels of interest rates have always been recognised as a risk to the HRA. These are managed through the Council's Treasury Management Strategy.
- Repairs and Maintenance: existing and emerging risks within the revenue repairs budget include unexpected increased demand (for example due to adverse weather conditions) and future changes to contractual arrangements.

39. The HRA business plan will be reviewed regularly along with expenditure plans to ensure flexibility to respond to the expected Housing and Planning Act Regulations.

## Place Risks

## 2017/18 Revenue Budget savings

40. The Place budget comprises three significant contracts - Streets Ahead programme, Waste Management contracts and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Levy - which together absorb 80\% of the General Fund support. The Portfolio cannot meet projected reductions in local authority funding by cutting only the remaining $20 \%$ of the budget without a significant reduction in services. Thus in the 2015-16 Business
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Planning round, the Portfolio's strategy was based on reducing the cost of these contracts to preserve the other services.
41. The South Yorkshire Transport Levy has been successfully reduced but not the Streets Ahead or Waste Management contracts. The Portfolio has now developed three strategic interventions including further savings from the ITA Levy which follow on from existing plans, reducing the level of support to Sports Trusts and embarking on a review of all the other services seeking a business-like approach to service delivery seeking to reduce cost or maximise income. Realising the efficiencies and opportunities within this review is crucial to maintaining the current Place savings. The review is at an early stage and requires swift implementation, along with a number of other strategic interventions, if the necessary revenue budget savings are to be realised in 2017/18. Failure to so do will very probably create an overspend pressure for the Council.
42. In light of the above risks, a review of waste services has taken place with a staged strategy agreed. As with any service change, there is a risk to the continuity of service delivery and in the longer term there is a potential financial risk if the expected investment does not result in better value services. There is also a risk to the short term achievement of the 2017/18 budget savings if the project timetable slips. In order to mitigate the risks a robust governance structure has been put in place to review progress and issues and make decisions to ensure that the optimum solution is achieved.
43. The Council has entered into a 25 year contract with Amey to maintain and renew the public highway. Part of this work involves the replacement of trees which are damaging the pavement with new varieties which are more suitable to a roadside location. The Council has successfully defended a legal challenge on the application of its policy. It has agreed a revised policy in respect of the removal of trees involving some public consultation. The hiatus in the programme caused by the legal action and potential subsequent delays during the consultation could make the Council vulnerable to substantial additional charges from the contractor.
44. $£ 0.9 \mathrm{~m}$ of the $2016 / 17$ budget saving initiatives ( $£ 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ on the Streets Ahead contract and $£ 0.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in Parking Services) had not been achieved to date. These will roll forward to 2017/18 as part of the base budget and create an immediate pressure in that and future years unless these are delivered or a sustainable mitigating cost saving can be identified.
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45. The Portfolio undertakes a number of complex, high profile capital projects which require strong cost control from the sponsor and project manager. Experience in 2016-17 has shown that this discipline is not present in all projects and has exposed the portfolio to a requirement to find funding from the Revenue Budget to fund the overspend.
46. Furthermore, the Council has agreed a number of contingent liabilities relating to developments within the city centre. If these were to crystallise there would be an immediate Revenue and Capital Budget impact

## Capital Receipts and Capital Programme

47. Failure to meet significant year on year capital receipts targets due to reduced landvalues reflecting the uncertain market and the impact of the Affordable Housing policy. This could result in over-programming, delay or cancellation of capital schemes.

## Project Cost Control

48. There is an inherent risk within all the programme of overspending on any single project as a result of unforeseen circumstances (e.g. ground conditions or contamination) or poor management and planning. There have been several examples of this during 2016-17. The Council has made significant improvements in the management of capital projects including improved risk management, however, in the event of an overspend it will have to use its own limited resources to plug the gap.

## Housing Regeneration

49. There is a risk to delivering the full scope of major schemes such as Park Hill and other regeneration schemes because of the instability in the housing market. This could result in schemes 'stalling', leading to increased costs of holding the sites involved.

## Olympic Legacy Park

50. The Council supports the on-going development of the Olympic Legacy Park to regenerate the Lower Don Valley. Some parts of the infrastructure need private party or external funding to realise the vision. The Council has an obligation to provide a number of facilities to the educational establishment facilities on site against a very tight timescale. If the other site developments do not proceed in time, the Council may have to step in with funding which will place additional strain on the funding of the capital programme.
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## Sheffield Retail Quarter

51. The Council has committed to incur around $£ 60 \mathrm{~m}$ to acquire land, secure planning consent, and appoint a development manager to deliver the new retail quarter in the city centre. The scheme is being funded through prudential borrowing which will be repaid from the increased Business Rates that the completed scheme will produce (known as Tax Incremental financing (TIF). The financing costs are being capitalised while the scheme is in development. There is a risk that if the scheme ceases to be active that the financing costs of circa $£ 3 \mathrm{~m}$ pa will have to be provided for from existing budgets. There is also a longer term risk that if the scheme does go ahead, the business rates generated are not sufficient to cover the financing costs. In order to mitigate these risks the Council is working closely with its advisors and potential tenants to ensure that a viable scheme is being developed. It is also ensuring that the level of TIF is set at a prudent level.
52. In addition to the $£ 60 \mathrm{~m}$ already committed, the Council may in future have to invest substantial sums (potentially several hundred million pounds) to create the public realm and develop a proposition which an external investment developer would take forward. This may also involve the construction of buildings on a speculative basis with only part of the building pre let. The Council has recently approved a further $£ 86 \mathrm{~m}$ for the construction of the first building in the Retail Quarter on this basis.

## Schools' Expansion programme

53. In February 2016 the Cabinet approved a report setting out the need to provide additional places in primary, secondary and Sixth Form establishments. The immediate demand for places in the next three years will require the Council to commit funds ahead of receipt from central government. The latest estimate of the gap is a maximum of $£ 20 \mathrm{~m}$ in 2018/19 after mitigating action. In subsequent years it expects to receive sufficient funding to repay the cash flow by 2020/21.
54. In the event of a change of government policy which reduced the financial support available to local authorities' capital programmes, the Council would very probably be faced with a greater affordability gap in the schools' capital programme than has already been identified above requiring it to contribute its own capital resources.
55. The Council already faces pressure to maintain the condition of the school building estate so there is a limited opportunity to divert funds earmarked for maintenance to support the school place expansion
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programme. The Council has taken steps to minimise this exposure by challenging the construction industry to build to a specific cost target against Education Funding Agency standards, and, matching the provision of some 16-18 year places to demand.
56. The modelling of the Schools Capital Programme has been based on an allocation of $£ 21 \mathrm{~m}$ Basic Need funding being in 2019/20, 20/21 and 21/22 - however the allocation that has recently been confirmed for $19 / 20$ at lower level of $£ 9.8 \mathrm{~m}$ which could effectively push back the repayment period on the current advance commitment of Basic Need by 2 years. The service is challenging the basis of the allocation with the Department for Education and there may be alternative funding streams.

## Annual Treasury Management Review 2016/17

## Executive Summary

This report reviews the performance of the treasury management function which manages the authority's debt and investment portfolios.

The treasury management function's activity is agreed by Council each year through the Treasury Management Strategy which details how we'll manage cash requirements, investments, and the need for debt to fund the capital programme.

Assessment of the performance is based upon indicators which are largely governed by the 'Prudential Code' set by the sector's accounting body CIPFA - and approved by government.

## Key Points

## Overall Limits

- The Council operated within the Prudential Indicator Limits for 2016/17 set by the authority.
- These limits include the amount of debt the Council can hold
- This limit is set by Council each year and cannot be breached


## The Council's Debt Position

- After adjusting for PFI liabilities of $£ 426 \mathrm{~m}$, the overall underlying debt of the authority (referred to as the Capital Financing Requirement or CFR) was $£ 988$ m (up $£ 70 \mathrm{~m}$ on $2015 / 16$ 's figure of $£ 918 \mathrm{~m}$ ).
- Planned capital investment for $2016 / 17$ increased by $£ 13.3 \mathrm{~m}$. Some of which relates represents slippage from 2015/16, and is therefore simply a timing issue rather than an increase to the overall capital programme.
- Debt, excluding PFI liabilities, has increased by a net $£ 7 m$ after accounting for maturing loans.
- Of this debt figure, $£ 346 \mathrm{~m}$ related to the HRA (unchanged on last year) which was also slightly below expectations set out in the TMS.
- HRA debt relates to legacy housing investment, such as the Decent Homes programme.


## The Council's Loan Portfolio

- As at 31 March 2017, the loans portfolio, excluding PFI liabilities, totalled $£ 747$ m indicating that we are under borrowed by $£ 241 \mathrm{~m}$ - up $£ 43 \mathrm{~m}$ on 2015/16 (£198m).
- Under-borrowed means that rather than go to banks or other external bodies for loans, we have at various points used our own cash balances that weren't required at that time
- This is an efficient use of resources - as we avoid interest on loans but does mean at some stage we will need to replace the cash we have 'borrowed' from ourselves in the short term ( $£ 198 \mathrm{~m}$ )
- It's important that we don't run up too large an under-borrowed position, as we would increase the risk of interest rates moving against us, and us having to borrow later at higher rates than currently.
- During 2016/17, $£ 25 m$ of borrowing was taken to help fund the capital programme and manage the under borrowed position
- Borrowing now makes economic sense as were able to take advantage of historically low borrowing rates and to ensure the under borrowed level remains at manageable levels in line with the treasury management strategy.
- However, $£ 16 \mathrm{~m}$ of the short term borrowing undertaken last year for cash flow purposes was repaid in April 2016 and repaid $£ 2 \mathrm{~m}$ of maturing debt which was not replaced. The net increase in borrowing is only $£ 7 \mathrm{~m}$
- Despite the historically low borrowing levels we chose not to borrow more at this time because we felt that both market conditions (low interest rates) and our existing cash levels supported the current strategy.
- The average rate of interest paid on the Council's external debt has decreased slightly to $4.3 \%$ for 2016/17 compared to $4.4 \%$ for 2015/16 partly as a result of loans with higher interest rates maturing and the new loans being taken at a lower level of interest rate (the average new loan rate was 2.41\%).


## Investment Portfolio

- As at 31 March 2017, investments totalled $£ 85 m$, down from $£ 87 m$ last year. Among other things, the cash was used to secure a discount on pension deficit payments - helping to secure savings to offset pressures on revenue budgets in the medium term.
- Overall, a return of 0.36\% (0.56\% in 2015/16) was achieved, compared to a benchmark of UK Bank Base rate of $0.25 \%$ (down from 0.50\% in August 2016).
- Investments have been made in high quality counterparties such as AAA rated Money Market Funds and UK Banks in line with the Council's investment priorities: which are security first, liquidity second and then return. This ensures we do not chase yield at the expense of the security of our investment.
- The capital financing budget generated $£ 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ of one off savings as a result of deferring some of the planned borrowing and earning interest on better than expected investment balances which averaged $£ 138.7$ m over the year.


## Introduction

This Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual treasury management review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2016/17. This report meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code).

During 2016/17 the full Council received the Annual Treasury Strategy whilst Cabinet were presented with the Outturn Report. A Mid-Year Report was also taken to the Cabinet Member for Finance during the year.

The regulatory environment places responsibility on members for the review and scrutiny of treasury management policy and activities. This report is therefore important in that respect, as it provides details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlights compliance with the Council's policies previously approved by members.

No Member training on treasury management issues was provided during the year. However, training took place in January 2015 when the Treasury Management Strategy was set for the 2015/16 financial year.

## The Strategy for 2016/17

The expectation for interest rates within the treasury management strategy for 2016/17 anticipated a low but rising Bank Rate (starting in quarter 1 of 2017), and gradual rises in medium and longer term fixed borrowing rates during 2016/17. Variable, or short-term rates, were expected to be the cheaper form of borrowing over the period. Continued uncertainty in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis promoted a cautious approach, whereby investment decisions would continue to be
dominated by low counterparty risk considerations, resulting in relatively low returns compared to borrowing rates.

In this scenario the treasury strategy was to postpone borrowing, to avoid the cost of holding higher levels of investments and the associated cost of carry, and to reduce counterparty risk.

However, as set out in the 2016/17 treasury management strategy, we planned to maintain the level of under borrowing at a prudent level, and therefore planned to take a little more borrowing than would be required by in-year capital expenditure.

There was major volatility in PWLB rates throughout the year with rates falling during quarters 1 and 2 to reach historically very low levels in July and August (following the EU Referendum decision), before rising significantly during quarter 3, and then partially easing back towards the end of the year.

During the year, we took $£ 25 m$ of borrowing but repaid $£ 16 m$ of short term borrowing taken for term cash flow purposes, and a further $£ 2 \mathrm{~m}$ of maturing debt was repaid without being replaced. This has meant that the level of under borrowing has increased during the year to $£ 241 \mathrm{~m}$ - of which $£ 55$ m relates to the HRA.

## Overall Treasury Position as at 31 March 2017

At the beginning and the end of 2016/17 the Council's treasury (excluding debt from PFI and finance leases) position was as follows:

| Authority | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Principal | Rate/ <br> Return | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Principal | Rate/ <br> Return |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total debt | $£ 740 \mathrm{~m}$ | $4.4 \%$ | $£ 747 m$ | $4.3 \%$ |
| CFR | $£ 938 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 988 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| Over / (under) borrowing | $(£ 198 \mathrm{~m})$ |  | $(£ 241 \mathrm{~m})$ |  |
| Total investments | $£ 87 \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.56 \%$ | $£ 85 \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.36 \%$ |
| Net debt | $£ 653 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 662 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |


| General Fund | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Principal | Rate/ <br> Return | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Principal | Rate/ <br> Return |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total debt | $£ 448 m$ | $4.2 \%$ | $£ 456 \mathrm{~m}$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| CFR | $£ 572 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 642 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| Over / (under) borrowing | $(£ 124 \mathrm{~m})$ |  | $(£ 186 \mathrm{~m})$ |  |
| Total investments | $£ 87 m$ | $0.56 \%$ | $£ 85 \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.36 \%$ |
| Net debt | $£ 361 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 371 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |


| HRA | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Principal <br> Return | Rate/ <br> Return <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Principal | Rate/ <br> Return |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total debt | $£ 292 m$ | $4.6 \%$ | $£ 291 m$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| CFR | $£ 346 m$ |  | $£ 346 m$ |  |
| Over / (under) borrowing | $(£ 54 m)$ |  | $(£ 55 m)$ |  |
| Total investments | $£ 0 m$ | $0 \%$ | $£ 0 m$ | $0 \%$ |
| Net debt | $£ 292 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 291 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |

## The Economy and Interest Rates

The two major landmark events that had a significant influence on financial markets in the 2016-17 financial year were the UK EU referendum on 23 June and the election of President Trump in the USA on 9 November. The first event had an immediate impact in terms of market expectations of when the first increase in Bank Rate would happen, pushing it back from quarter 3 2018 to quarter 42019.

At its August meeting, the Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) cut Bank Rate from $0.5 \%$ to $0.25 \%$ and the Bank of England's Inflation Report produced forecasts warning of a major shock to economic activity in the UK, which would cause economic growth to fall almost to zero in the second half of 2016. The MPC also warned that it would be considering cutting Bank Rate again towards the end of 2016 in order to support growth. In addition, it restarted quantitative easing with purchases of $£ 60$ bn of gilts and $£ 10$ bn of corporate bonds, and also introduced the Term Funding Scheme whereby potentially $£ 100$ bn of cheap financing was made available to banks.

In the second half of 2016, the UK economy confounded the Bank's pessimistic forecasts of August. After a disappointing quarter 1 of only $+0.2 \%$ GDP growth, the three subsequent quarters of 2016 came in at $+0.6 \%,+0.5 \%$ and $+0.7 \%$ to produce an annual growth for 2016 overall, compared to 2015 , of $1.8 \%$, which was very nearly the fastest rate of growth
of any of the G7 countries. Needless to say, this meant that the MPC did not cut Bank Rate again after August but, since then, inflation has risen rapidly due to the effects of the sharp devaluation of sterling after the referendum. By the end of March 2017, sterling was 17\% down against the dollar but had not fallen as far against the euro. In February 2017, the latest CPI inflation figure had risen to $2.3 \%$, above the MPC's inflation target of $2 \%$. However, the MPC's view was that it would look through near term supply side driven inflation, (i.e. not raise Bank Rate), caused by sterling's devaluation, despite forecasting that inflation would reach nearly 3\% during 2017 and 2018. This outlook, however, is dependent on domestically generated inflation, (i.e. wage inflation), continuing to remain subdued despite the fact that unemployment is at historically very low levels and is on a downward trend. Market expectations for the first increase in Bank Rate moved forward to quarter 32018 by the end of March 2017 in response to increasing concerns around inflation.

USA: Quarterly growth in the US has been very volatile during 2016 but a strong performance since mid-2016, and strongly rising inflation, prompted the Fed into raising rates in December 2016 and March 2017. The US is the first major western country to start on a progressive upswing in rates. Overall growth in 2016 was $1.6 \%$.

EU: The EU is furthest away from an upswing in rates; the European Central Bank (ECB) has cut rates into negative territory, provided huge tranches of cheap financing and been doing major quantitative easing purchases of debt during 2016-17 in order to boost growth from consistently weak levels, and to get inflation up from near zero towards its target of $2 \%$. These purchases have resulted in depressed bond yields in the EU, but, towards the end of 2016, yields rose, probably due at least in part to rising political concerns around the positive prospects for populist parties and impending general elections in 2017 in the Netherlands, France and Germany. The action taken by the ECB has resulted in economic growth improving significantly in the Eurozone to an overall figure of $1.7 \%$ for 2016, with Germany achieving a rate of $1.9 \%$ as the fastest growing G7 country.

On the other hand, President Trump's election and promise of fiscal stimulus, which are likely to increase growth and inflationary pressures in the US, have resulted in US Treasury yields rising sharply since his election. Gilt yields in the UK have been caught between these two influences and the result is that the gap in yield between US treasuries and UK gilts has widened sharply during 2016/17 due to market perceptions that the UK is still likely to be two years behind the US in starting on an upswing in rates despite a track record of four years of strong growth.

Japan: struggled to stimulate consistent significant growth with GDP averaging only $1.0 \%$ in 2016 with current indications pointing to a similar
figure for 2017. It is also struggling to get inflation up to its target of 2\%, only achieving an average of $-0.1 \%$ in 2016, despite huge monetary and fiscal stimulus, though this is currently expected to increase to around $1 \%$ in 2017. It is also making little progress on fundamental reform of the economy.

China and emerging market counties: At the start of 2016, there were considerable fears that China's economic growth could be heading towards a hard landing, which could then destabilise some emerging market countries particularly exposed to a Chinese economic slowdown and / or to the effects of a major reduction in revenue from low oil prices. These fears have largely subsided and oil prices have partially recovered so, overall, world growth prospects have improved during the year.

Equity Markets: The result of the referendum, and the consequent devaluation of sterling, boosted the shares of many FTSE 100 companies which had major earnings which were not denominated in sterling. The overall trend since then has been steeply upwards and received further momentum after Donald Trump was elected President as he had promised a major fiscal stimulus to boost the US economy and growth rate.

## The Borrowing Requirement and Debt

The Council's underlying need to borrow to finance capital expenditure is termed the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR).

The CFR goes up when we use borrowing to fund capital projects, but falls as we put money aside each year to repay that debt. The money we put aside to repay the debt each year is known as our 'minimum revenue provision' (MRP), and mimics depreciation charges that are used in the private sector.

The table below shows the outturn for 2015/16 and 2016/17 and the 2017/18 budget position including PFI liabilities.

|  | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Actual <br> $\mathbf{( £ m )}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 /}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Budget <br> $\mathbf{( £ m )}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Actual <br> $\mathbf{( £ m )}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund CFR - non PFI | $£ 572 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 608 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 642 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| General Fund - PFI Liabilities | $£ 395 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 426 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 426 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Overall General Fund CFR | $£ 967 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 1034 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 1,068 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| CFR HRA | $£ 346 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 349 \mathrm{~m}$ | $£ 346 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Total CFR | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 3 1 3 \mathrm { m }}$ | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 3 8 3 \mathrm { m }}$ | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 4 1 4 \mathrm { m }}$ |

## Borrowing Rates in 2016/17

This section reviews the movement in borrowing rates over the year; showing the decline in rates over the period but also the volatility experience as markets have responded to a variety of economic factors (see Economy and Interest Rates section).

During 2016-17, PWLB rates fell from April to June and then gaining fresh downward impetus after the EU referendum and Bank Rate cut, before staging a partial recovery through to December and then falling slightly through to the end of March.

PWLB certainty maturity borrowing rates - the graph and table for PWLB rates below show, for a selection of maturity periods, the average borrowing rates, the high and low points in rates, spreads and individual rates at the start and the end of the financial year.


|  | 1 Year | 5 Year | 10 Year | 25 Year | 50 Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 4 / 16$ | $1.13 \%$ | $1.62 \%$ | $2.31 \%$ | $3.14 \%$ | $2.95 \%$ |
| $31 / 3 / 17$ | $0.83 \%$ | $1.24 \%$ | $1.60 \%$ | $1.80 \%$ | $2.07 \%$ |
| Low | $0.76 \%$ | $0.95 \%$ | $1.42 \%$ | $2.08 \%$ | $1.87 \%$ |
| Date | $20 / 12 / 2016$ | $10 / 08 / 2016$ | $10 / 08 / 2016$ | $12 / 08 / 2016$ | $30 / 08 / 2016$ |
| High | $1.20 \%$ | $1.80 \%$ | $2.51 \%$ | $3.28 \%$ | $3.08 \%$ |
| Date | $27 / 04 / 2016$ | $27 / 04 / 2016$ | $27 / 04 / 2016$ | $27 / 04 / 2016$ | $27 / 04 / 2016$ |
| Average | $0.93 \%$ | $1.36 \%$ | $2.01 \%$ | $2.72 \%$ | $2.49 \%$ |

## Borrowing Outturn for 2016/17

## Borrowing

The Council took $£ 25$ m worth of additional borrowing during the year to support the Council's capital investment programme. The table below shows the breakdown of capital investment being funded through prudential borrowing in 2016/17.

|  | $\mathbf{£ ' m}^{\prime} \mathbf{m}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sheffield Retail Quarter | 15.2 |
| Streets Ahead | 27.5 |
| Leisure Improvements | 16.1 |
| Housing Repairs \& Maint | 4.3 |
| Other Programmes | 2.6 |
|  | 65.7 |

The variance between the $£ 65.7 \mathrm{~m}$ of capital expenditure funded through borrowing and the actual loans taken of $£ 25 \mathrm{~m}$ reflects that we decided to use existing cash balances we weren't yet using rather than take additional loans. Doing this saves us on loan interest costs but means the under borrowed position (the cash we owe ourselves) has gone up.

Details of the borrowing taken in 2016/17 are shown in the table below

| Start <br> Date | Maturity <br> Date | Counterparty | Rate <br> $\%$ | Principal <br> $\mathbf{O / S}$ <br> $\mathbf{£ \prime 0 0 \mathbf { s }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2024$ | PWLB | $1.92 \%$ | $£ 2,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2025$ | PWLB | $2.03 \%$ | $£ 3,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2026$ | PWLB | $2.14 \%$ | $£ 4,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2028$ | PWLB | $2.33 \%$ | $£ 2,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2032$ | PWLB | $2.65 \%$ | $£ 2,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2033$ | PWLB | $2.71 \%$ | $£ 2,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2063$ | PWLB | $2.64 \%$ | $£ 5,000$ |
| $14 / 06 / 2016$ | $14 / 06 / 2064$ | PWLB | $2.64 \%$ | $£ 5,000$ |
|  |  | Total | $\mathbf{2 . 4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{£ 2 5 , 0 0 0}$ |

As stated above in the strategy for 2016/17 section of the report, the borrowing has been taken to fund the capital programme and to help maintain the level of under borrowing at a prudent level.

The overall borrowing rate on these loans of $2.41 \%$ was below the budgeted level, and has therefore resulted in revenue savings.

The Council chose not to borrow as much as we suggested we would in the Treasury Management Strategy for the year because we believe that market conditions (interest rates and cost of borrowing) will remain low in the short term, and we did not require as much cash as we estimated.

This mid-year decision was taken in consultation with the Head of Strategic Finance, and meant that the capital financing budget underspent for the year. This underspend was used to help support the Corporate budget.

## Rescheduling

No rescheduling was done during the year as the average $1 \%$ differential between PWLB new borrowing and premature repayment rates made rescheduling unviable.

## Investment Rates in 2016/17

After the EU referendum, the UK Bank Rate was cut from 0.5\% to 0.25\% on $4^{\text {th }}$ August and remained at that level for the rest of the year. Market expectations as to the timing of the start of monetary tightening started the year at quarter 3 2018, but then moved back to around the end of 2019 in early August before finishing the year back at quarter 3 2018. Deposit rates fell during the first two quarters and fell even further after the August MPC meeting resulted in a large tranche of cheap financing being made available to the banking sector by the Bank of England. Rates made a weak recovery towards the end of 2016 but then fell to fresh lows in March 2017.


LIBID is the London Interbank Bid Rate which reflects the average interest rate which major London banks borrow Eurocurrency deposits from other banks and is a key indicator of interest rates on short term deposits.

## Investment Outturn for 2016/17

Ethical Investment Policy - the Council's investment policy, which is governed by government guidance, is set out in the annual investment strategy approved by full Council in March each year. This policy outlines the approach for choosing investment counterparties, and is based on credit ratings provided by the three main credit rating agencies supplemented by additional market data (such as rating outlooks, credit default swaps, etc.). In addition, the Council commits not to hold any direct investments in fossil fuels or, to the best of our knowledge, companies involved in tax evasion or grave misconduct.

The investment activity during the year conformed to the approved strategy, and the Council had no liquidity difficulties.

Investments held by the Council - the Council maintained an average balance of $£ 138.7 \mathrm{~m}$ of internally managed funds compared to the Council only having funds for day to day cash flow purposes. The internally managed funds earned an average rate of return of $0.36 \%$ against a budgeted return of $0.50 \%$ (i.e. in line with UK Base Rate at the time when the strategy was set). The UK Base Rate was changed from 0.50\% to 0.25\% in August 2016 and therefore the weighted average return was $0.34 \%$ so the actual return achieved reflects a slightly better return than anticipated.

The Council would not normally plan to have such high cash balances but they have been bolstered by the additional borrowing taken to lock into historically low borrowing rates and the position continues to be affected by re-profiling of the capital programme.

The Council's decision not to borrow as much money as planned for through the treasury strategy reflects that these balances were higher than anticipated.

The pie charts below shows that we split our investments over a range of investment options, including AAA rated Money Market Funds and Fixed Term or Call accounts deposits with banks.


Money market funds are an attractive counterparty to mitigate counterparty risk because they only invest in the most secure assets whilst they allow us to remove our investment day-by-day should we need to.

## Annex: Prudential and Treasury Indicators

During 2016/17, the Council complied with its legislative and regulatory requirements including the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code). The key actual prudential and treasury indicators detailing the impact of capital expenditure activities during the year, with comparators, are as follows:

| Actual prudential and treasury indicators | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015/16 } \\ \text { Actual } \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2016 / 17 \\ \text { Original } \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016/17 } \\ \text { Actual } \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capital expenditure <br> - General Fund <br> - HRA <br> - Total | $\begin{array}{r} 153,484 \\ 72,718 \\ 226,202 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89,011 \\ 113,085 \\ 202,096 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 141,822 \\ 73,530 \\ 215,352 \end{array}$ |
| Capital Financing Requirement: <br> - General Fund <br> - HRA <br> - Total | $\begin{array}{r} 987,416 \\ 345,996 \\ 1,333,412 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,029,773 \\ 353,068 \\ 1,382,841 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,068,096 \\ 345,968 \\ 1,414,064 \end{array}$ |
| Gross debt | 1,135,192 | 1,246,445 | 1,172,870 |
| Net External debt (gross debt less investments) | 1,048,510 | 1,174,334 | 1,088,204 |
| Investments <br> - Longer than 1 year <br> - Under 1 year <br> - Total | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Nil} \\ 86,682 \\ 86,862 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Nil } \\ 72,111 \\ 72,111 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Nil } \\ 84,666 \\ 84,666 \end{array}$ |

## Commentary

The Council's net external debt has increased by around $£ 39.7 \mathrm{~m}$ during the year, whilst our overall need for borrowing which is represented by the Capital Financing Requirement has increased by $£ 80.7 \mathrm{~m}$.

The CFR increases when we use borrowing to fund capital projects, whilst external debt goes up when we take on new loans or other credit arrangements such as PFI liabilities.

Net debt has increased as a result of a decision taken by the Council to ensure the level of under borrowing (where the level of borrowing is lower than the underlying need to borrow as set out in the CFR) is maintained at prudent levels.

In order to lock into historically low borrowing rates, the Council has taken $£ 25 \mathrm{~m}$ of new borrowing (excluding PFI arrangements).

However, following the above strategy combined with an under spend on the capital programme meant that the Council continued to hold large sums of cash on deposit throughout the year. These deposits were placed with an array of AAA rated, instant access money market funds and fixedterm and call account deposits with banks. This investment policy meant that our deposits were very safe but deposit returns were relatively low at $0.36 \%$ (albeit in line with the average UK Bank Base Rate of 0.34\% during 2016/17).

Gross borrowing and the CFR - in order to ensure that borrowing levels are prudent over the medium term and only for a capital purpose, the Council should ensure that its gross external borrowing does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of the capital financing requirement in the preceding year $(2015 / 16)$ plus the estimates of any additional capital financing requirement for the current (2016/17) and next two financial years. This essentially means that the Council is not borrowing to support revenue expenditure. This indicator allows the Council some flexibility to borrow in advance of its immediate capital needs.

The authorised limit - the authorised limit is the "affordable borrowing limit" required by s3 of the Local Government Act 2003. Once this has been set, the Council does not have the power to borrow above this level. The table below demonstrates that during 2016/17 the Council has maintained gross borrowing within its authorised limit.

The operational boundary - the operational boundary is the expected borrowing position of the Council during the year. Periods where the actual position is either below or over the boundary is acceptable subject to the authorised limit not being breached.

Actual financing costs as a proportion of net revenue stream - this indicator identifies the trend in the cost of capital (borrowing and other long term obligation costs net of investment income) against the net revenue stream.

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Authorised limit | $£ 1,625 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Maximum gross borrowing position | $£ 1,175 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Operational boundary | $£ 1,425 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Average gross borrowing position | $£ 1,154 \mathrm{~m}$ |


| Ratio of financing costs to net <br> revenue stream | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Actual | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ <br> Original <br> limits | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | $16 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ |
| HRA | $10 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |


| Incremental impact of capital <br> investment decisions | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Actual | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / \mathbf { 1 7 }}$ <br> Original <br> limits | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase in council tax (band D) <br> per annum | $£ 35.77$ | $£ 39.19^{*}$ | $£ 33.75$ |
| Increase in average housing rent <br> per week (council dwellings only) | $£ 0.00$ | $£ 0.05$ | $£ 0.00$ |

*The calculation of the impact on Band D properties has been adjusted to reflect in-year movements only; the previous limit was calculated on a basis consistent with the treasury strategy methodology of a rolling 5 year programme (inclusive of prior costs). The change has been made to make the impact of the current year's activity clearer to the reader.

The increase in Council Tax (band D) per annum for 2016/17 is lower than the 2016/17 limit because the borrowing was lower than forecast. Figures above are calculated on the additional borrowing requirement and the additional MRP that became chargeable during the financial year.

The indicators shown above are an unsophisticated interpretation of our capital financing position that under regulation we are required to show. It is important to recognise that the Council aims to borrow to fund capital programme activity where that activity will in turn generate savings through more efficient working or income generation other than borrowing for major schemes e.g. new schools. As such, though the amount of money we spend on things like interest costs may rise from one year to the next, these costs support borrowing that will enable larger savings to be made.

A good example of this is where borrowing is used to support the Streets Ahead project. Borrowing for this project incurs debt costs, but allows us to move away from expensive and inefficient responsive repairs to a cheaper more effective planned maintenance programme.

| TABLE 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 31 \text { March } \\ & 2016 \\ & \text { Principal } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Rate/ Return | Average <br> Life <br> (Yrs) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 31 \text { March } \\ 2017 \\ \text { Principal } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Rate/ Return | Average <br> Life <br> (Yrs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed rate funding: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PWLB | £351m | 4.53\% | 22 | £374m | 4.34\% | 21 |
| Market | £140m | 4.03\% | 52 | £188m | 4.24\% | 47 |
| Local Authorities | £71m | 2.30\% | 3 | £55m | 2.23\% | 3 |
| Variable rate funding: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PWLB | £0m | 0\% | - | £0m | 0\% | - |
| Market | £178m | 5.07\% | 42 | £130m | 5.20\% | 46 |
| Credit Liabilities: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PFI <br> Liabilities | £395m | 9.51\% |  | £426m | 9.51\% |  |
| Total debt | £1,135m | 6.1\% | 30 | £1,173m | 6.1\% | 30 |
| CFR | £1,333m |  |  | E1,414m |  |  |
| Over/ (under) borrowing | (£198m) |  |  | (£241m) |  |  |
| Total investments | £87m | 0.6\% | <1 | £85m | 0.5\% | <1 |
| Net debt | £1,048m |  |  | £1,088m |  |  |

The maturity structure of the debt portfolio was as follows:

|  | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Actual | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ <br> Original <br> (Max) Limits | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 12 months * | $27 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| 12 months \& within 24 months | $3 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| 24 months \& within 5 years | $4 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 5 years and within 10 years | $6 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 10 years and above | $60 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $67 \%$ |

[^0]The maturity structure of the investment portfolio was as follows:

| Investments | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 / 1 6}$ <br> Actual <br> $\mathbf{£ 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ <br> Original <br> $\mathbf{£ 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ <br> Actual <br> $\mathbf{£ 0 0 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Longer than 1 year <br> Under 1 year | 0 | 0 | 0 <br> Total |

The exposure to fixed and variable rates was as follows:

|  | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ <br> Actual | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ <br> Original <br> Limits | $\mathbf{3 1}$ March <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ <br> Actual |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fixed rate debt | $£ 957 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 1,043 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Fixed rate investments | $-£ 15 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $-£ 8 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Net fixed rate exposure | $\mathbf{£ 9 4 2 \mathrm { m }}$ | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 2 4 7 m}$ | $\mathbf{£ 1 , 0 3 5 \mathrm { m }}$ |
| Variable rate debt | $£ 178 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $£ 130 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Variable rate investments | $-£ 72 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | $-£ 77 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Net variable rate exposure | $\mathbf{£ 1 0 6 m}$ | $\mathbf{£ 1 7 8 m}$ | $\mathbf{£ 5 3 m}$ |
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|  | Approval Type | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Value } \\ & £ 000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scheme Description |  |  |
| Depot Rationalisation Project <br> - The current depot stock is of poor condition, with a backlog of maintenance built up over time due to insufficient investment. Consequently, significant investment is required to bring depots up to the required standard to remain compliant with Health \& Safety legislation and fit for purpose in terms of operational delivery. <br> - Condition surveys are due to be undertaken over the next 18 months to accurately quantify the investment required, but a conservative estimate is $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ over the next 4 years. <br> - The depots are also costly to operate. The three core depots (Staniforth Road, Manor Lane and Olive Grove) have annual operating costs of around $£ 1.3 \mathrm{~m}$, and Solpro has operating costs of around $£ 250$ k. <br> - The insourcing of the Repairs and Maintenance services from Kier, the progression of the Streets Ahead Programme from the construction to maintenance phase, and the review of waste services contract all provide opportunities to re-evaluate our depot stock with an aim of rationalising the estate. <br> - A Strategic Business Case (SBC) has been approved by the Asset Rationalisation Board to conduct further analysis to determine the operational and financial viability of reducing the number of core depots and ending the lease agreement forSolpro. Initial findings suggest that around $£ 3.3 \mathrm{~m}$ could be saved over the next 4 years by only operating with just two core depots (comprising of savings, cost avoidance and potential capital receipts). <br> - The funding request is to support the development of the Full Business Case (FBC), which will define both the service delivery and property changes that are required to realise the financial and operational benefits. The FBC is expected to take 5 months to complete. | New | £150 |
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## CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING AS AT 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ MARCH 2017

## Summary

1. The approved capital programme budget for $2016 / 17$ at 31 March 2017 (Month 12) was £241.9m.
2. This is an increase of $£ 3.9 \mathrm{~m}$ from Month 11 due to authorised changes to budget as summarised in Section 9.
3. The full year outturn was $£ 215.4 \mathrm{~m}$ - a variance of $£ 3.4 \mathrm{~m}$ on the $£ 212.0 \mathrm{~m}$ forecast in the last published report at Month 10.
4. This represents a year end slippage figure of $£ 26.5 \mathrm{~m}$ or $11 \%$ of the overall approved budget. This compares to a year end slippage figure of $15 \%$ at the 2015/16 year end.
5. The table below summarises the outturn position by programme.

| Portfolio | $2016-17$ <br> OUTTURN | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2016-17 \\ & \text { BUDGET } \end{aligned}$ | VARIANCE ON BUDGET | CHANGE ON LAST FORECAST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Children and Young People | 19,883 | 23,689 | $(3,805)$ | $(2,313)$ |
| Place | 70,743 | 77,571 | $(6,828)$ | $(4,035)$ |
| Housing | 73,530 | 83,074 | $(9,545)$ | $(1,907)$ |
| Highways | 9,769 | 11,828 | $(2,059)$ | 323 |
| Communities | (35) | - | (35) | (81) |
| Resources | 8,498 | 12,742 | $(4,244)$ | 655 |
| Corporate | 32,963 | 32,963 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 215,352 | 241,868 | $(26,516)$ | $(7,358)$ |

NB. As part of year end closure procedures a revised division of joint operations on Maintenance and Fire Risk Assessment Works between Resources and Children and Young People (CYP) has been reflected in the figures above. The overall impact of this has been to reduce the variance on Resources spend to budget by $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ and increase the variance on CYP budget by $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$.


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Outcome } \\
& \text { Board }
\end{aligned}
$$

| $-38 \%$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Some work planned to be completed in 2016-17 has slipped to 2017- } \\ \text { 18. Bulk meter work instruction being finalised. }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |


$-12 \% ~$| 73 acquisitions completed. Acquisition costs for the 7 remaining |
| :--- | :--- |
| properties will slip into 2017/18 |


| $-10 \%$ | Underspend due to refusals and work not required. Slipped into $2017-18$ pending full reconcilaition of further budget requirements |
| :--- | :--- | $-46 \%$ Delayed start on site from Nov 16 to Jan 17. Project completion

Higher number than expected of loft works required which has slowed progress on contract
Underspend on the project is due to one of three main contractors,
Underspend on the project is due to one of three main contractors,
who have had issues recruiting adequate resources to deliver their programme. The underspend on the project has been partially mitigated through allocation of additional works to other contractors.
Delayed start on site due to change in priority site list, delays in asbestos surveys and delays from the contractor.

$-100 \%$ Scheme affordability issues under consideration.
Delays to programme caused by abnormals, poor ground conditions $-24 \%$ and delays in stats. The scheme is expected to overspend overall
however funding has now been secured to cover this.
$-89 \%$ complete due to delay in securing SCRIF funding
$-17 \%$ Delay in starting asbestos clearance works.
$-£ 806,597$
$-£ 705,236$
$-£ 675,322$
-£464,002
$\infty$
0
0
0
0
0
4
4
4
1
+
$\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$
Year End
Variance


| Team |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Resources |  |  |

$£ 450,000 \quad-£ 450,000$


|  | $£ 3,690,182$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

$£ 62,081,596-£ 13,901,065 \quad 1$

£2,108,948
$£ 5,974,543$

| $\infty$ |
| :---: |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |




-     - 
- 

Homes Board
Homes Board
Homes Board

Homes Board | Leadership |
| :--- |
| Team |

Thriving
Neighbourhood
$s$ and s and
Commu Communities モ62,081,596

pıeog səmor


 | Strong |
| :--- |
| Economy | Strong

Economy Design fees not charged. Planned property purchase not yet

| $-17 \%$ | Delay in starting asbestos clearance works. |
| :--- | :--- |

$£ 550,381 \quad-£ 539,461 \quad-98 \%$ Tender unsuccessful, project being redesigned and then retendered
Appendix 8

| Project Name | Portfolio | Outcome Board | Full Year Budget | Year End <br> Variance | \% Var | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tinsley Primary | CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE | Capital \& Growth | £6,665,161 | -£1,613,039 | -24\% | $£ 1.1 \mathrm{~m}$ of slippage is contingency relating to a projected underspend on the project awaiting final confirmation |
| Flat Roofing | COMMUNITIES | Homes Board | £4,325,769 | -£605,762 | -14\% | Underspend slipped as required to cover already known and potential future claims from contractor. Any remaining underspend will be a saving. |
| Heating Breakdowns | COMMUNITIES | Homes Board | £1,000,000 | -£493,743 | -49\% | Heating Breakdown outputs vary throughout the year as they are carried out as and when they arise. There has been a reduction seen in these as more obsolete system renewals have been completed. Underspend due to less requirement as more obsolete boilers have been replaced. through separate programme. |
| Total |  |  | £11,990,930 | -£2,712,545 |  |  |


| Project Name | Portfolio | Outcome Board | Full Year <br> Budget | Year End <br> Variance | \% Var | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sheffield Retail Quarter 2 | PLACE | SRQ Board | £8,649,144 | -£584,154 | -7\% | majority of slippage relates to an element of contingency in the annual budget. |
| Disabled Grants | COMMUNITIES | Neighbourhoods Regeneration Board | £3,058,441 | -£466,734 | -15\% | $50 \%$ increase in annual allocation of Government Grant allocated to Disabled Grants increased budget beyond current delivery capacity |
| Owlthorpe Tw Dev Agmt | PLACE | Strong Economy | £432,000 | -£431,050 | -100\% | One off payment to fulfill contractual obligation slipped 1 month. |
| Health \& Safety Compliance | RESOURCES | Resources Leadership Team | £393,105 | -£393,105 | -100\% | Funding allocation not utilised in year. No impact on current programme delivery. |
| Total |  |  | £12,532,689 | - 11,875,043 |  |  |

Slippage not affecting programme delivery
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As indicated in the tables above approximately $25 \%$ of the major slippage items are not a result of "under delivery" but either due to genuine project savings or issues relating to the nature of scheme funding.

## Overview of Capital Programme

7. The overall programme has increased by $£ 11.3 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 966.4 \mathrm{~m}$. The key reasons for the overall increase relate to:

- Growing Places Fund loan to Doncaster Council (administered on behalf of the Sheffield City Region) ( $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ )
- Administration of Transport Grant Funding on behalf of City Region Partners ( $£ 2 \mathrm{~m}$ ).
- Annual Interest charges on borrowing for Sheffield Retail Quarter (£2.2m)
- Inclusion of the Digital Incubator Grant Funding on the capital programme ( $£ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ )
- Inclusion of the Garage Improvement Strategy in the capital programme ( $£ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$ ). Though this will be offset through a reduction in future allocations.

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 / 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 / 1 8}$ | Future | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{£ m}$ | $\mathbf{£ m}$ | $\mathbf{£ m}$ | $\mathbf{£ m}$ |
| Month 11 Approved Budget | 238.6 | $\mathbf{2 5 4 . 5}$ | 462.0 | 955.1 |
| Additions | 3.1 | 5.5 | 1.2 | 9.8 |
| Variations | 1.5 | -0.1 | 0.2 | 1.6 |
| Slippage and Acceleration | -1.3 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Month 12 Approved Budget | $\mathbf{2 4 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 6 . 4}$ |

## General Commentary

8. Appendix 8.5 summarises the Top 20 projects in the Capital Programme. This group accounts for $67 \%$ of the current 2016/17 budget. This information indicates major Project Life Time overspends on:
(a) Lower Don Valley Flood Defence (expected to be mitigated by increased resources from the Environment Agency and SCC see section 12)
(b) Olympic Legacy Park - Additional contribution from Sheffield University to meet additional costs.
9. As identified at section 5 the overall outturn position on the capital programme was $£ 26.5 \mathrm{~m}$ below budget with all areas spending below
expected budgets to a greater or lesser degree. The key reasons for the major variances are presented in the tables at Section 6.
10. Appendix 8.6 provides a detailed breakdown of the $£ 26.5 \mathrm{~m}$ between slippage, accelerated expenditure, underspends and overspends by service area and individual scheme.

## Risks

11. There are several projects where the anticipated spend in $16 / 17$ is significantly behind plan but the funding is secure to complete the work, however the following projects present specific risks in respect of potential unfunded expenditure.

- The Lower Don Valley Flood defences work is at risk of overspending. The unknown workload and novel nature of the design creates an inherent risk of overspend. This project is grant funded with promised specific outcomes which could leave the Authority exposed to clawback if these are not achieved. The latest position indicates a likely overspend on the project of $£ 2.5 \mathrm{~m}$. Current negotiations with the Environment Agency indicate the availability of an additional $£ 1.35 \mathrm{~m}$ grant funding with SCC to provide the remaining $£ 1.15 \mathrm{~m}$ potentially from Community Infrastructure Levy.


## Approvals

12. A number of schemes have been submitted for approval in line with the Council's agreed capital approval process.

Below is a summary of the number and total value of schemes in each approval category:

- 1 additions to the programme with a value of $£ 19 \mathrm{k}$
- 9 variations to the programme with a value of $£ 2.4 \mathrm{~m}$
- 1 item of slippage into $18 / 19$ and beyond $£ 3 \mathrm{~m}$

Further details on these schemes can be found at Appendix 8.1 and 8.2.
13. Approval is also sought to enter into an agreement to provide funding to Green Estates to allow delivery of a package Open Spaces works. The details of this can be found at Appendix 8.3.
14. Approval is also requested to accept the terms of a grant from the Rugby Football Union. Details of which can be found at Appendix 8.4.
15. In addition approval is sought for the budget adjustments required as part of the financial year end close down procedure relating to the $£ 26.5 \mathrm{~m}$ budget variance reported above.
Below is a summary of the values in each approval category:

- Slippage of expenditure from $16 / 17$ to 17/18-£25.9m
- Accelerated Spend of expenditure from 17/18 into 16/17-£1.5m
- Overspends - net additions to the programme - $£ 1.4 \mathrm{~m}$
- Underspends - $£ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$

Full details summarised by service and broken down by individual project can be found at appendix 8.6

## Capital Finance - May 2017

l'8 x!puədd $\forall$

| Scheme Description | Approval Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Value } \\ & £ 000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Procurement Route |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES |  |  |  |
| Highways |  |  |  |
| Accident Savings Schemes - Firth Park <br> The Accident Savings programme is a citywide strategy to reduce actual (and the fear of) road traffic collisions, particularly focused on reducing killed and seriously injured (KSIs) casualties by implementing road safety engineering schemes at sites with the highest injury collision rates in the City. The Council has a statutory duty under the Road Traffic Act 1988 to promote road safety. <br> Approval has already been given to construct a small road safety scheme at the junction of Firth Park Road and Bolsover Road, which should reduce vehicle speeds at this junction and make it easier for pedestrians to cross the road. <br> Following receipt of the Bill of Quantities a variation is required to meet the final costs needed to implement the scheme. Although designed in 2014/15, implementation has been delayed to tie in with Amey core carriageway surfacing works. <br> N.B. This variation also funds small allocations for Road Safety Audits (RSA)3/4 costs of historical schemes that are no longer live | Variation | 11 | Call off under Schedule 7 of the Streets Ahead Amey PFI Contract |

Appendix 8.1

| Project Management Costs and HMD fees: $£ 5,000$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Firth Park Construction: $£ 85,000$ |  |  |
| TOTAL $£ 90,000$ however the original approval received was for $£ 85 \mathrm{k}$ |  |  |
| Final Costs (Final Business Case May 2017) |  |  |
| Project Management Costs and HMD fees: $£ 7,050$ |  |  |
| Firth Park Construction: $£ 88,130$ |  |  |
| TOTAL $£ 95,180$ |  |  |
| 17/18 RSA Costs: $£ 955$ |  |  |
| TOTAL $£ 96,135$ |  |  |
| Therefore variation required: $£ 95,180$ Firth Park final costs $-£ 85,000$ existing CAF + |  |  |
| $£ 95517 / 18$ RSA Costs = $£ 11,135$ |  |  |
| Funded by Local Transport Plan (LTP) |  |  |
| N.B. not been actioned as a Director's Variation because there is also slippage on this |  |  |
| Business Unit |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Housing |  |  |
| Disabled Facilities Grant |  |  |
| This submission is to increase the 2017/18 by a further $£ 1,690,722$ due to an increase |  |  |
| in the grant allocation for $2017 / 18$. This will give a total $2017 / 18$ budget of $£ 4,031,226$. |  |  |
| The scheme is to provide adaptations to private sector properties and is supported by |  |  |
| government grant that has increased to $£ 3.5$ in $2016 / 17$ and $£ 3.8 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2017 / 18$. |  |  |
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$£ 340,504$ was not spent in 16/17 and this can be slipped into 17/18.
The budget of $£ 4,031,226$ should provide around 865 total outputs.
Hull - Humber Sub Region HAL
This is a request for approval of new funding of $£ 393,100$ ( $£ 385,000$ Hull Private
Sector budget, $£ 8,100$ repaid loans received $2016 / 17$ ) \& reallocate funds of $£ 100,000$
held by SCC previously allocated for Hull CC Landlord Loans. Output 38 loans average
loan $£ 12,000$. All the sub-regional funding is already held in SCC accounts.
$£ 113,223$ slippage $\& £ 393,100$ new funding $\& £ 100,000$ re-allocated funding =
$£ 606,323$ new budget split $£ 456,323$ for $2017 / 18 \& £ 150,000$ for $2018 / 19$. Total outputs
will be 50 loans, 35 in $2017 / 18 \& 15$ in $2018 / 19$, average loan value of $£ 12,000$.
New Build housing Phase 1
This CAF is to seek approval to increase the overall budget for the scheme by $£ 55,121$ This is split to cover an overspend in 2016/17 of $£ 40,056$ and to increase the 2017/18
budget by $£ 15,065$ from $£ 2,000$ to $£ 17,065$. Delays relating to services and utilities
have caused the contractor to claim an Extension of Time against SCC, which was
responsible for organising diversions and relocations. In turn, following project
completion, SCC will seek to make a claim against its utilities contractor for errors
leading to these delays. If successful this claim would return the scheme cost within the existing budget. In the meantime, an increase of $£ 55 \mathrm{k}$ in budget is required to cover the expenditure necessary to complete the project
l'8 x!puədd $\forall$
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| Parks |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S106 Parks Programme Additional Agreements <br> Following approval of an Outline Business Case at Thriving Neighbourhoods \& Communities Board 26th February 2016 a programme of works and improvements at SCC Parks and Green Spaces was agreed. The Programme totalling $£ 1.7 \mathrm{~m}$ and funded by various Open Space S106 agreements was delegated to the Green \& Open Spaces Board, who achieved Cabinet approval in March16. <br> Green \& Open Spaces Board have approved a further list of Open Space S106 agreements to be used at sites that the S106 conditions allow, with those sites agreed by the appropriate Ward Councillors. This will add a further $£ 205,400$ Capital to the Programme allowing more spend on some existing allocated sites as well as improvements at newly identified sites. <br> This list and a paper giving details of progress on the existing approvals were presented to Thriving Neighbourhoods \& Communities Board 15th May 2017, who approved the additions to the Programme. <br> Financial approval is therefore sought to add these S106 agreements and proposed sites to the existing Programme. <br> Please see the separate Appendix 8.2 for the list of S106 agreements, proposed sites and interventions. | Variation | 205 | Individual procurement strategies per scheme as determined by the Director of Financial \& Commercial Services in line with the requested delegation |

l'8 x!puədd $\forall$
63
Variation
Norfolk Heritage Park Playground
The budget and objective to provide improved access into the park and to develop
improved play facilities by:
removing the existing climbing unit in the over 8 's play area, installing new robust
equipment, carrying out associated landscaping and re-surfacing following consultation
with users and residents, installing a new bridge and steps to improve access into the
site was reported to Cabinet in April 2017
It was reported that full payment of one of the S106 agreements funding the project had
not been received and therefore the budget would remain at $£ 230,506$ until it was
received. The total project budget reported at that time was $£ 297,618$, a difference of
$£ 67,112$
The value of that particular S106 agreement was under negotiation with the Sheffield
Housing Company and the final value settled on is slightly less than expected. The
variation requested is therefore $£ 63,185$ which has been confirmed now the payment
from Sheffield Housing Company has been received.
The total project budget is therefore: $£ 230,506+£ 63,185=£ 293,691$ which is $£ 3,927$
less than the original budget
Parks staff are confident that the same scope of work can be delivered within that
budget which they will show in a Final Business Case when they've tendered for the
playground works.
Funded by S106
Appendix 8.1

Wedge Pocket Park
Carry out works to replace unfit play facilities, and restore the secure and dog free toddlers'/children's play area
S106 ref 879 = £9,167
Most of the S106 funding secured for this project is already Cabinet approved as it
forms part of the £1.7m Parks Programme approved in March16. S106 ref 1206 for
$£ 19,237$ has been added to the funding which therefore needs separate EMT/Cabinet
approval.

## SLIPPAGE / ACCELERATED SPEND:-

THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES
delivery of the scheme and therefore the budgets need to slip forward.
As a result, procurement will not take place until later in 2017. $£ 43,507$ will slip from
$2016 / 17$ into $2017 / 18$. However, then $2017 / 18$ is to reduce by $£ 3,000,921$ with
$£ 2,526,517$ slipping into $2018 / 19$ and $£ 474,404$ slipping into 2019/20.
The new profiled budgets are £56,072 spent in 2016/17, £2,292,069 in 2017/18,
$£ 3,432,428$ in 2018/19 and $£ 474,404$ in 2019/20.
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| 14/02646/FUL | 1242 | South east | Plumbley Hall Road Sheffield | £1,598.56 |  |  |  | Hollow Lane OS - contribution to MUGA improvement project <br> Agreed by Ward Councillors - meeting 19/12/16 | Confirmed | Agreed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14/02232/FUL | 1249 | South West | Barns To The Rear Of Moor View Farm, 522 Manchester Rd | £4,186.23 | £3,348.98 | £502.35 | £334.90 | Hagg lane allotments - access and environmental improvements Councillors Agreed Jul16 SW LAP meeting. | Confirmed | Agreed |
| 14/02155/FUL | 1251 | South West | Moor View Farm 522 Manchester Road Fulwood, S10 5PQ | £9,791.18 | £7,832.95 | £1,174.94 | $£ 783.29$ | Hagg lane allotments - access and environmental improvements Councillors Agreed Jul16 SW LAP meeting. | Confirmed | Agreed |
| 15/04274/FUL | 1319 | South West | Fleur De Lys Hotel Totley Hall Lane Sheffield | £12,084.11 | £9,667.29 | £1,450.09 | $£ 966.73$ | Totley Bents for sports drainage works or Totley Hall Park sports, environmental and play improvements. <br> Councillors agreed in principle (Jan17 LAP meeting) | Confirmed | Agreed |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & p_{3 / 04204 / C O N} \\ & \rightarrow 9 \end{aligned}$ | 1321 | South West | Site Of <br> Abbeydale <br> Grange School <br> Hastings Road <br> Sheffield, S7 <br> 2GU | £95,404.35 | £76,323.48 | £11,448.52 | £7,632.35 | Recommend recreational infrastructure improvements at the site of the former Bannerdale Centre, in line with Bannerdale green framework (proposed district park). Councillors agreed LAP meeting Jan17 | Confirmed | Agreed |
| N 12/02311/FUL | 1108 | Central | Land Off <br> Langsett Road \& Whitehouse, Whitehouse Lane, | £19,342.58 | £15,474.06 | £2,321.11 | £1,547.41 | Recommend Philadelphia - MUGA and associated environmental improvements Agreed by councillors -N.Gibson meeting (3Apr17), Ben Curran Olivia Blake (02/05/17) | Confirmed | agreed |
| 14/04117/FUL | 1307 | North | Land To The Rear Of Worrall Hall Farm, Top Road | £14,966.13 | £11,972.90 | £1,795.94 | £1,197.29 | Sycamore Park is named within the Planning Agreement. <br> Play, skate park and/or environmental improvements to the park. <br> Councillors - to be informed | Confirmed | Agreed |
| 10/02859/FUL | 1000 | South West | Texaco Filling <br> Station, 850 <br> Ecclesall Road | £6,320 | £5056.00 | $£ 758.40$ | £505.60 | Bingham Park - tennis courts area improvement project. <br> Councillors agreed - emailed agreement lead by CIIr M Shaffaq 24/04/17 | Confirmed | Agreed |
| 12/00204/FUL | 1106 | Central |  | Agreed: £9,191 Should be $£ 5,035$ | £4,028 | £604.20 | £402.80 | Philadelphia Gardens - already approved on $£ 1.7 \mathrm{~m}$ programme but the available S106 was incorrect. Total reduction in capital £4,760.20 | Confirmed | Agreed |

ع'8 x!puәdd $\forall$

| Grant to be Paid to | SCC Funding Source | Project to be funded by the Grant | Conditions and Obligations | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Value } \\ & £ 000 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Green Estates Ltd | S106 Parks Programme | Environmental Improvement, <br> Access <br>  <br> Play Renewal at <br> Manor Fields, <br>  <br> Wedge Pocket <br> Park Sites | Standard SCC Funding Agreement checked and signed off by Legal Services. This includes that the recipient will comply with the terms of SCC Contracts Standing Orders (i.e. quotations and tendering) <br> SPECIAL CONDITIONS <br> 1. The Grant Recipient shall appoint in accordance with Clause 10 a competent, qualified contractor to carry out the design, supervision and post installation inspection of the Works. <br> 2. The Grant Recipient shall ensure that the design, supervision, post installation and ongoing inspection and maintenance shall be in accordance with the BS EN 15312:2007 Free access multi-sports equipment. <br> 3. The Grant Recipient shall submit to the Council prior to tendering of the Works the final design details and specifications and any further documents requested by the Council for approval. <br> 4. The Grant Recipient shall, on completion of the Works, obtain a post installation inspection certificate which conforms to the European Design Standards referred to in Special Condition 2 above and provide a copy of the | 64 |

Appendix 8.3

|  |  |  | certificate to the Project Manager. <br> 5. The Grant Recipient shall procure the design and construction of the Works and thereby assume the full duties and responsibilities of 'client' for the Works including those duties imposed by the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007 (CDM Regulations). <br> 6. The Grant Recipient shall be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the Multi Use Games Area facilities and the associated costs of this. <br> Works (and therefore funding) to be completed by $30^{\text {th }}$ June 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

†‘8 x!puədd $\forall$

| Grant Awarding <br> Body | Name of the <br> Grant | Project to be <br> funded by the <br> Grant | Conditions and Obligations <br> Football Union <br> (RFU) | RFU Facility <br> Fund Round 5 <br> - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LUL/275/R5/A6 | Construction of <br> two new rugby <br> pitches at <br> Westfield | The Award <br> The RFU is offering a capital grant to SCC solely towards the <br> project.This must be claimed before the 30 <br> Grant is being given towards total project costs of $£ 2,334,614$. <br> Therefore, SCC \& Parklife funding towards the project is <br> $£ 2,284,615$. The grant is subject to a ten (10) year clawback <br> period. | Value <br> $£ 000$ |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { forecast to RFU. Once the cashflow forecast has been agreed } \\ \text { with RFU, the Award will be paid out in monthly instalments } \\ \text { against the Supervising Officer's Certificate and/or invoices } \\ \text { from the contractor. } \\ \text { Until RFU confirm in writing that they consent to the project } \\ \text { starting, RFU will make no payments of the Award. }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Procurement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCC is to confirm that three competitive tenders for the |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| provision of the facility will be obtained \& comply with all |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| applicable procurement rules in accordance with normal tender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& contract procedures. Prior to starting the work SCC must |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| provide a written explanation as to why the successful tender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| was accepted \& provide relevant documents to RFU. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Insurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCC must have a comprehensive policy of insurance. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$\}$

Expenditure
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|  |  | Current Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Life of Project |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BU | Project | $\begin{gathered} \text { YTD } \\ \text { Actual } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YTD } \\ \text { Budget } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { YTD } \\ \text { Variance } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ \text { Outturn } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ \text { Budget } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ \text { Variance } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Variance $\qquad$ | Delivery Forecast RAG | Finance Forecast RAG | All Years Outturn | All Years Budget | All Years Variance | Delivery RAG | Finance RAG |
| 0011992099987 | CAPITAL PFI CONTRIBUTIONS | 27,500 | 27,500 | - | 27,500 | 27,500 | - | 0.0\% | G | G | 67,331 | 67,331 |  | G | G |
| 0014065397418 | PITCHED ROOFING \& ROOFLINE | 19,864 | 22,673 | $(2,809)$ | 19,864 | 22,673 | $(2,809)$ | -12.4\% | G | R | 78,285 | 78,695 | (410) | G | G |
| 0012046394119 | MSF FINANCE | 11,446 | 11,446 | (0) | 11,446 | 11,446 | (0) | 0.0\% | NR | G | 114,710 | 114,710 | (0) | NR | G |
| 0012018694010 | LDV FLOOD DEFENCE WORKS | 8,024 | 10,581 | $(2,557)$ | 8,024 | 10,581 | $(2,557)$ | -24.2\% | R | R | 14,203 | 11,843 | 2,360 | R | R |
| 0012018594026 | LIGHT WEIGHTING PROJECT | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | 0.0\% | NR | G | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | NR | G |
| 0012018494050 | SHEFFIELD RETAIL QUARTER 2 | 8,065 | 8,649 | (584) | 8,065 | 8,649 | (584) | -6.8\% | G | A | 18,045 | 18,045 | (0) | G | G |
| 0013001490762 | TINSLEY PRIMARY | 5,052 | 6,665 | $(1,613)$ | 5,052 | 6,665 | $(1,613)$ | -24.2\% | G | R | 5,885 | 6,665 | (780) | G | A |
| 0012046394105 | GRAVES NCSEM PROJECT | 6,639 | 6,625 | 14 | 6,639 | 6,625 | 14 | 0.2\% | G | G | 6,639 | 6,625 | 14 | G | G |
| 0014065397442 | KITCHEN/BATHRM PLANNED REPLMT | 5,906 | 6,581 | (675) | 5,906 | 6,581 | (675) | -10.3\% | G | R | 39,134 | 38,907 | 227 | G | G |
| 0014059197551 | COUNCIL HSG ACQUISITIONS PROG | 5,269 | 5,975 | (705) | 5,269 | 5,975 | (705) | -11.8\% | G | R | 21,626 | 21,631 | (4) | G | G |
| 0014065397441 | COMMUNAL AREAS-LOW RISE FLATS | 5,809 | 5,766 | 43 | 5,809 | 5,766 | 43 | 0.7\% | G | G | 32,938 | 32,895 | 43 | G | G |
| 0014060697321 | PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT COSTS GF | 5,444 | 5,696 | (252) | 5,444 | 5,696 | (252) | -4.4\% | G | G | 28,524 | 28,776 | (252) | G | G |
| 0012018694020 | BROOKHILL AREA IMPROVEMENTS | 4,864 | 4,972 | (108) | 4,864 | 4,972 | (108) | -2.2\% | R | G | 4,972 | 4,972 | (0) | R | G |
| 0011513890087 | HR+M TRANSPORT | 4,347 | 4,506 | (159) | 4,347 | 4,506 | (159) | -3.5\% | G | G | 5,776 | 5,776 | - | G | G |
| 0014065397419 | FLAT ROOFING | 3,720 | 4,326 | (606) | 3,720 | 4,326 | (606) | -14.0\% | G | R | 4,695 | 5,301 | (606) | G | G |
| 0012018494054 | SRQ OFFICES | 4,809 | 4,295 | 515 | 4,809 | 4,295 | 515 | 12.0\% | G | R | 77,644 | 77,720 | (76) | G | G |
| 0014059197552 | NEW BUILD COUNCIL HSG PHASE 1 | 4,249 | 4,209 | 40 | 4,249 | 4,209 | 40 | 1.0\% | A | G | 4,266 | 4,211 | 55 | A | G |
| 0012046394114 | OLP INFRASTRUCT PUBLIC REALM | 3,997 | 3,803 | 194 | 3,997 | 3,803 | 194 | 5.1\% | G | A | 5,022 | 4,908 | 115 | G | G |
| 0012076993890 | BRT NORTH: TINSLEY LINK (WP21 | 3,068 | 3,690 | (623) | 3,068 | 3,690 | (623) | -16.9\% | G | R | 3,702 | 3,690 | 12 | G | G |
| 0011992099991 | LEP - GROWING PLACES FUND | 3,410 | 3,410 | - | 3,410 | 3,410 | - | 0.0\% | NR | G | 3,410 | 3,410 | - | NR | G |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Top 20 Value | 151,484 | 161,369 | $(9,885)$ | 151,484 | 161,369 | $(9,885)$ | -6.1\% |  |  | 546,808 | 546,111 | 698 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rest of Programme | 63,868 | 80,521 | $(16,653)$ | 63,868 | 80,521 | $(16,653)$ | -20.7\% |  |  | 410,075 | 420,326 | $(10,251)$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Capital Programme Value | 215,352 | 241,890 | $(26,538)$ | 215,352 | 241,890 | $(26,538)$ | -11.0\% |  |  | 956,884 | 966,436 | $(9,553)$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% of Programme within the Top 20 | 70\% | 67\% | 37\% | 70\% | 67\% | 37\% |  |  |  | 57\% | 57\% | -7\% |  |  |
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| Portfolio | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BSR | 1,297,216 | 977,968 | 319,248 | 319,248 | - | - | - |  |
| CAMP | 19,341,377 | 17,828,778 | 1,512,599 | 2,220,264 | $(830,390)$ | $(1,797)$ | 124,523 |  |
| COMMUNITIES | - | $(35,062)$ | 35,062 | - | - | - | 35,062 |  |
| CORPORATE | 32,963,132 | 32,963,132 | (0.14) | - | - | - | - |  |
| CREATIVE SHEFFIELD | 26,492,948 | 23,083,055 | 3,409,893 | 3,422,449 | - | $(147,277)$ | 134,722 |  |
| CULTURE | 27,567,525 | 27,258,900 | 308,625 | 584,770 | $(194,410)$ | $(81,826)$ | 91 |  |
| CYP | 23,688,945 | 19,883,453 | 3,805,492 | 3,922,547 | $(162,342)$ | 9,065 | 36,221 |  |
| HIGHWAYS | 11,827,655 | 9,768,897 | 2,058,758 | 1,985,483 | $(51,238)$ | $(104,914)$ | 206,720 | 22,707 |
| HOUSING | 83,074,490 | 73,529,706 | 9,544,784 | 8,225,160 | $(224,671)$ | $(1,022,251)$ | 2,566,546 |  |
| PARKS | 2,832,247 | 1,571,140 | 1,261,107 | 1,205,285 | (275) | $(3,860)$ | 28,745 | 31,212 |
| PLANNING | 39,936 | 23,507 | 16,429 | 17,088 | - | (660) | - |  |
| RESOURCES | 12,742,216 | 8,498,465 | 4,243,751 | 3,945,425 | $(79,177)$ | $(51,913)$ | 429,417 |  |
| GRAND TOTAL | 241,867,686 | 215,351,938 | 26,515,747 | 25,847,720 | $(1,542,503)$ | $(1,405,433)$ | 3,562,046 | 53,919 |
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| Project Number Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal <br> Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94085 WASTE MGMT DEVELOPMENT | 1,297,216 | 977,968 | 319,248 | 319,248 | - | - | - |  | Delays in legal work on litigation and procurement. Peak workloads therefore haven't been reached yet |
| Total | 1,297,216 | 977,968 | 319,248 | 319,248 | - | - | - | - |  |

MAJOR PROJECTS

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90012 | CASTLE MARKET DECOMMISSIONING | 65,048 | 66,845 | $(1,797)$ | - | - | $(1,797)$ | - |  | Minor change to final costs. |
| 90019 | BANNERDALE ASSETENHANCE | 1,500 | $(5,193)$ | 6,693 | - | - | - | 6,693 |  | Savings on final project costs |
| 90032 | RESOURCE COSTS | 161,757 | 12,658 | 149,099 | 149,099 | - | - | - |  | Delay in Darnall and Millhouses schemes being progressed |
| 90200 | WOODHOUSE HUB | 450,000 | - | 450,000 | 450,000 | - | - | - |  | Delay in the scheme is due to scc and the developer being unable to agree a brief for the scheme, this is now expected to be resolved by September 17. |
| 90201 | HILLSBOROUGH HUB | - | 0 | (0) | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| 90202 | RELOCATION PARKING SERV | 19,477 | 1,647 | 17,830 | - | - | - | 17,830 |  | Project complete. Saving on final costs |
| 90204 | CIP - GRANGE CRESCENT | 16,755 | 13,539 | 3,216 | 3,216 | - | - | - |  | Minor slippage on initial feasibility costs. Main project of $£ 356 \mathrm{k}$ expected to be delivered in 17/18 |
| 90804 | WOODSEATS HUB | 71,551 | 10,228 | 61,323 | 61,323 | - | - | - |  | Slippage of $£ 61,323$ due to delay in agreeing scope of scheme. |
| 94050 | SHEFFIELD RETAIL QUARTER 2 | 8,649,144 | 8,064,989 | 584,154 | 584,154 | - | - | - |  | slippage due to delay in signing YW diversion agreement |
| 94051 | ASBESTOS REMOVAL - GROSVENOR | 45,904 | 44,181 | 1,723 | 1,723 | - | - | - |  | Project finished |
| 94052 | SRQ DEMOLITIONS | 1,306,314 | 1,198,738 | 107,576 | 107,576 | - | - | - |  | Slippage due to delay in contractor programme |
| 94053 | SRQ HIGHWAY ENABLING WORKS | 3,213,374 | 2,842,764 | 370,610 | 370,610 | - | - | - |  | Delays due to agreeing contract price and drainage issues. |
| 94054 | SRQ OFFICES | 4,294,735 | 4,809,408 | $(514,673)$ | - | $(514,673)$ | - | - |  | Apr 17 acceleration of $£ 514,672$ contractor works progressing in advance of original profile |
| 94439 | SHEFFIELD RETAIL QUARTER CPO | 100,000 | - | 100,000 | - | - | - | 100,000 |  | Historic budget allocation no longer required |
| Q0078 | SRQ | 413,818 | - | 413,818 | - | 413,818 | - | - |  | Strategic Development Partner Budget / spend on separate Business Units. Net accelerated expenditure of £315k |
| 94055 | SRQ - STRATEGIC DEV PARTNER | - | 728,536 | $(728,536)$ | - | $(728,536)$ | - | - |  | Strategic Development Partner Budget / spend on separate Business Units. Net accelerated expenditure of £315k |
| 94027 | OWLTHORPE TW DEV AGMT | 432,000 | 950 | 431,050 | 431,050 | - | - | - |  | Highways delay in agreeing s178 <br> agreement to allow payment to be made |
| 90205 | LAND ACQUISITION | - | 1,000 | $(1,000)$ | - | $(1,000)$ | - | - |  | Costs relate to Asset Enhancements Project. Correction |
| 90033 | ASSET ENHANCEMENT GB SITES | 100,000 | 38,488 | 61,512 | 61,512 | - | - | - |  | $£ 61,512$ slippage due to SCC's strategic whole city transport modelling delays resulting in insufficient information to progress individual site transport modelling. |
| Total |  | 19,341,377 | 17,828,778 | 1,512,599 | 2,220,264 | $(830,390)$ | $(1,797)$ | 124,523 | - |  |

COMMUNITIES
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CORPORATE

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustmen | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 99987 | CAPITAL PFI CONTRIBUTIONS | 27,499,866 | 27,499,866 | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| 99991 | LEP - GROWING PLACES FUND | 3,410,000 | 3,410,000 | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| 99992 | BPC-ABU | 2,053,266 | 2,053,266 | (0.14) | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 32,963,132 | 32,963,132 | 0.14) | - | - | - | - |  |  |

CREATIVE SHEFFIELD

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved <br> Expenditure Budget | OEO <br> Expenditure | Variance | Slippage | Accelerate <br> d Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90115 | KNUTTON ROAD | - | 54,046 | $(54,046)$ | - | - | $(54,046)$ | - |  | Residual grant payment due to SOAR. Funding was held for this purpose. No additional draw on SCC funds |
| 94004 | MOOR PUBLIC REALM PHASE 2 | - | 82,421 | $(82,421)$ | - | - | $(82,421)$ | - |  | Payment actually relates to repayment of unused funds under contractual agreement. No additional draw on SCC funds. |
| 94007 | SPITAL HILL ELLESMERE GREEN | 10,604 | 5,800 | 4,804 | - | - | - | 4,804 |  | $B U$ to be closed now finished |
| 94009 | PORTER BROOK REMEDIAL WORKS | - | 7,011 | $(7,011)$ | - | - | $(7,011)$ | - |  | Residual a contractor payment for which funding was in place. No additional draw on SCC funds. |
| 94010 | LDV FLOOD DEFENCE WORKS | 10,581,322 | 8,024,324 | 2,556,998 | 2,556,998 | - | - | - |  | Delays to the programme caused by abnormal, poor ground conditions and delays in stats. The scheme is expected to overspend overall however funding has now been secured to cover this. |
| 94013 | GREY TO GREEN | - | $(115,166)$ | 115,166 | - | - | - | 115,166 |  | Underspend due to final contract settlement at lower value than anticipated |
| 94017 | CULVERT ENHANCEMENT PROG | 91,388 | 28,198 | 63,190 | 63,190 | - | - | - |  | slippage due to delay in agreeing additional $£ 25 \mathrm{k}$ funding from Yorkshire Water, thus preventing procurement strategy being done. |
| 94020 | BROOKHILL AREA IMPROVEMENTS | 4,972,321 | 4,864,456 | 107,865 | 107,865 | - | - | - |  | Slippage required due to delays in construction |
| 94022 | KNOWLEDGE GATEWAY | 776,000 | 85,557 | 690,443 | 690,443 | - | - | - |  | Design fees not charged. Planned property purchase not yet complete due to delay in securing SCRIF funding |
| 94326 | EDWARD STREET | 46,313 | 31,561 | 14,752 | - | - | - | 14,752 |  | Project now finalised. |
| 94418 | CONNECT PEDESTRIAN SIGNS | - | 3,000 | $(3,000)$ | - | - | $(3,000)$ | - |  | Small residual spend for which funding was in place. No additional draw on SCC funds |
| 94456 | SPITAL HILL PUBLIC ART | - | 800 | (800) | - | - | (800) | - |  | N/A |
| 94024 | DIGITAL INCUBATOR | 15,000 | 11,048 | 3,952 | 3,952 | - | - | - |  | Slippage of $£ 3,952$ due to delays in agreeing the funding agreement. To be slipped into March 2018 |
| Total |  | 16,492,948 | 13,083,055 | 3,409,893 | 3,422,449 | - | $(147,277)$ | 134,722 | - |  |

CULTURE

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure <br> 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94102 | RE-OPENING OF WOODBOURN | - | 3,008 | $(3,008)$ | - | - | $(3,008)$ | - |  | Residual final costs for which historic grant funding was held. No additional draw on SCC funds. |
| 94104 | NORTH ACTIVE | 328,853 | 376,370 | $(47,516)$ | - | - | $(47,516)$ | - |  | £47k o/spend represents less than $1 \%$ of $£ 7.8 \mathrm{~m}$ project value. Funded by additional revenue contributions. |
| 94105 | GRAVES NCSEM PROJECT | 6,624,978 | 6,638,708 | $(13,729)$ | - | - | $(13,729)$ | - |  | $£ 14 \mathrm{k}$ o/spend represents less than $1 \%$ of $£ 16.3 \mathrm{~m}$ project value. Funded by additional revenue contributions. |
| 94107 | DVS REMEDIATION | 483,214 | 401,661 | 81,553 | 81,553 | - | - | - |  | Costs in dispute with contractor so slippage required to make final payments. |
| 94109 | FA PITCH (GRAVES) | 847,034 | 864,607 | $(17,573)$ | - | - | $(17,573)$ | - |  | £17k o/spend represents less than $1 \%$ of $£ 3.6 \mathrm{~m}$ project value. Funded by additional revenue contributions |
| 94110 | FA PITCH (THORNCLIFFE) | 1,705,314 | 1,668,286 | 37,028 | 37,028 | - | - | - |  | Apr 17 slippage of $£ 37,028$ due to outstanding works to ramp and CCTV. |
| 94113 | OLP INFRASTRUCTURE | 301,050 | 7,462 | 293,588 | 293,588 | - | - | - |  | Slippage of $£ 293,588$ required from 1617, to cover payment to UTC |
| 94114 | OLP INFRASTRUCT PUBLIC REALM | 3,803,024 | 3,997,434 | $(194,410)$ | - | $(194,410)$ | - | - |  | Accelerated expenditure due to recovery of project timescales following previous slippage request. |
| 94115 | FA PITCH (WESTFIELD) | 1,807,381 | 1,644,599 | 162,782 | 162,782 | - | - | - |  | Slippage due to delay as a result of planning conditions |
| 94120 | TINSLEY ART PROJECT | 61,328 | 51,510 | 9,818 | 9,818 | - | - | - |  | Slippage is due to design stages of project taking longer than anticipated. Expenditure re-profiled to reflect current timescales. |
| 94457 | WOMEN OF STEEL | 35,587 | 35,497 | 90 | - | - | - | 90 |  |  |
| 94514 | PARSON CROSS PARK PUBLIC ART | 12,127 | 12,127 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |  |  |
| 94119 | MSF FINANCE | 11,446,323 | 11,446,323 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |  |  |
| Total |  | 27,456,215 | 27,147,589 | 308,625 | 584,770 | $(194,410)$ | $(81,826)$ | 91 | - |  |
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CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90159 | FRA WORKS 16-17 | 1,012,500 | 82,493 | 930,007 | 930,007 | - | - | - |  | Asbestos survey delays, main contractor delays and changes in priorities of various sites |
| 90448 | SF DEVOLVED CAPITAL 2011-12 | 958,779 | 927,831 | 30,948 | 30,948 | - | - | - |  | School allocation, can be spent over 3 year period |
| 90479 | POST IMPLEMENTATION | 1,462 | 736 | 726 | 726 | - | - | - |  | Small slippage required to cover final account |
| 90613 | SCC INTERNAL PROG. COSTS - W4 | 7,468 | 7,468 | - | - | - | - | - |  | Close: scheme now complete: PM confirmed |
| 90614 | LEP BUSINESS PLAN - W4 | 95,756 | 87,328 | 8,428 | 8,428 | - | - | - |  | LEP fees/insurance still to be charged |
| 90620 | KING EDWARDS (UP) | 70,467 | 70,467 | - | - | - | - | - |  | Close: scheme complete: PM confirmed |
| 90627 | ADD'L PUPIL PLACES(SECONDARY) | 55,190 | 8,630 | 46,560 | 46,560 | - | - | - |  | Outstanding legal issue as per PM |
| 90639 | SCC CONTRACT COSTS - W4 | 302,723 | 267,382 | 35,341 | 35,341 | - | - | - |  | ICT fees/work to complete in 17-18 |
| 90678 | FEASIBILITY \& DESIGN | 59,602 | 67,551 | $(7,949)$ | - | - | $(7,949)$ | - |  | Additional works added; can now be closed per PM |
| 90691 | PMY MAINT. EMERGENCY WORKS | 760,000 | 739,043 | 20,957 | 20,957 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: fewer emergencies than anticipated (hard to anticipate emergency work by its nature) |
| 90692 | PMY MAINT.CONDITION MGT | $(8,111)$ | - | $(8,111)$ | - | - | $(8,111)$ | - |  | Close: PM confirmed |
| 90704 | FOSTER CARER HOUSING ENHANCE | 78,079 | - | 78,079 | 78,079 | - | - | - |  | Delays in quotes and time taken to establish and agree plans for building work |
| 90716 | GRACE OWEN NURSERY | 39,763 | 24,763 | 15,000 | 1,000 | - | - | 14,000 |  | Hold for retention, Underspend due to reduced F\&E requirement by nursery |
| 90732 | NEW PMY - WATERMEAD | 15,564 | 11,904 | 3,660 | - | - | - | 3,660 |  | Underspend on ICT budget; can now be closed per PM |
| 90734 | NORFOLK PARK PMY REPLACEMENT | $(148,512)$ | $(96,637)$ | $(51,875)$ | - | - | $(51,875)$ | - |  | Final account higher than anticipated (but less than previous budget adjustment); can now be closed per PM |
| 90737 | GLEADLESS PRIMARY - REBUILD | 2,899,998 | 2,783,029 | 116,970 | 116,970 | 0 | - | - |  | Slippage, after $£ 192 \mathrm{k}$ budget increase, due to compensation claims still not agreed |
| 90744 | FEL CAPITAL | 105,401 | 91,683 | 13,717 | 13,717 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: slight delay in implementation of IT works - est completed by Virgin in July 17 |
| 90745 | THORNBRIDGE ACCESSIBLE UNIT | 727,471 | 713,347 | 14,124 | 14,124 | - | - | - |  | Slipped due to construction delays resulting in $F \& E$ having to be ordered later, as no storage room until the building was finished. |
| 90746 | GREYSTONES EXPANSION | 415,487 | 447,185 | $(31,699)$ | - | - | $(31,699)$ | - |  | Additional £33k enabling works undertaken by T\&C Williams being missed out of the costs when the CAF revision was done to cover the final account. |
| 90747 | HALLAM RECONFIGURATION | 2,244,199 | 2,163,943 | 80,255 | 80,255 | - | - | - |  | Outstanding contractor claims yet to be agreed. |
| 90757 | FRA WORKS PROGRAMME - 14/15 | 96,072 | 2,379 | 93,693 | - | - | - | 93,693 |  | Final account complete: close: PM confirmed: Underspend due to reduced asbestos removal and contingency pot not required |
| 90761 | DON VALLEY SCHOOL | 35,422 | 188,304 | $(152,882)$ | - | $(152,882)$ | - | - |  | Change to ICT spending profile by the Academy |
| 90762 | TINSLEY PRIMARY | 6,665,161 | 5,052,122 | 1,613,039 | 833,744 | - | - | 779,295 |  | Slippage to cover demolition; Underspend due to savings on Provisional sums/risk items |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal <br> Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90763 | ROWAN EXPANSION | 16,637 | 4,022 | 12,615 | 12,615 | - | - | - |  | Awaiting final account agreement |
| 90764 | PRINCE EDWARD PRIMARY | 41,000 | 41,001 | (1) | - | - | (1) | - |  | Close: PM confirmed |
| 90768 | OUGHTIBRIDGE EXTENSION | 1,543 | 29,841 | $(28,298)$ | - | - | $(28,298)$ | - |  | Overspend due to 3 weeks delay on underpinning. Retention £20k still to be paid. |
| 90769 | ALDINE HOUSE - SUNDRY WORKS | 6,261 | 4,228 | 2,033 | 2,033 | - | - | - |  | Slippage required for an IT Cabinet; due early 2017/18 |
| 90770 | ALDINE HOUSE - EXTENSION | - | $(20,977)$ | 20,977 | - | - | - | 20,977 |  | $£ 20,159.55$ to reimburse Maint Block Allocatn \& small resultant Underspend of $£ 817.78$ : retention still outstanding |
| 90771 | ADAPTATIONS | 103,236 | 72,911 | 30,325 | 30,325 | - | - | - |  | Slippage, as demand-led adaptations in schools: balance to be added to 17/18 planned works of $£ 100 \mathrm{k}$ |
| 90773 | ALDINE HOUSE-2 BED EXTENSION | 126,184 | 135,644 | $(9,460)$ | - | $(9,460)$ | - | - |  | Acceleration reason: reprofile of works as a result of negotiation with Supplier and subcontractor; with prior year Q60 funding Adj't |
| 90775 | ALDINE HOUSE-INTERNAL REFURBS | - | $(25,462)$ | 25,462 | - | - | - | 25,462 |  | Credit to correct Prior Year overspend: CYPF Maint funding now reimbursed. $2 \mathrm{o} / \mathrm{s}$ PO's to be cancelled then close |
| 90776 | DOBCROFT INFTS-1 YR EXPANSION | 2,375 | (13) | 2,388 | - | - | - | 2,388 |  | Small Underspend, hold open for retention payment |
| 90777 | HALFWAY INFTS -MOBILE REPLACE | 223,686 | 224,286 | (600) | - | - | (600) | - |  | Small overspend hold open for retention |
| 90779 | PIPWORTH PMY- PLANT ROOM | 603,225 | 585,760 | 17,465 | 17,465 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: final contract account to be certified May 17 |
| 90790 | RAINBOW FORGE -HME | 742,282 | 762,345 | $(20,063)$ | - | - | $(20,063)$ | - |  | overspend reason: Additional Asbestos encountered |
| 90791 | PMY MAINT MEERSBROOK WIN-ROOF | 414,726 | 359,949 | 54,777 | 54,777 | - | - | - |  | Due to Contractors issuing apportioned costs for 3 sites (Meersbrook, Bradway \& Shortbrook) but actual split of costs slightly different across them. |
| 90792 | PMY MAINT BRADWAY ROOF | 209,497 | 212,502 | $(3,005)$ | - | - | $(3,005)$ | - |  | Due to Contractors issuing apportioned costs for 3 sites (Meersbrook, Bradway \& Shortbrook) but actual split of costs slightly different across them. |
| 90793 | PMY MAINT SHORTBROOK WINDOWS | 239,061 | 224,611 | 14,450 | 14,450 | - | - | - |  | Due to Contractors issuing apportioned costs for 3 sites (Meersbrook, Bradway \& Shortbrook) but actual split of costs slightly different across them. |
| 90794 | ALDINE HOUSE HEATING | 104,471 | 91,914 | 12,557 | - | - | - | 12,557 |  | All complete: small Underspend; can now be closed per PM |
| 90796 | FIRS HILL 2013 BULGE YEAR | 51,342 | 50,522 | 819 | - | - | - | 819 |  | 1 \% Underspend: small variation; can now be closed per PM |
| 90797 | NEW 8FE SEC SCH - SW | 1,389,299 | 1,018,744 | 370,555 | 370,555 | - | - | - |  | Delay due to requirement for additional surveys and planning issues. |
| 90798 | 1FE EXPANSION - ECCLESALL INF | 309,074 | 326,284 | $(17,210)$ | - | - | $(17,210)$ | - |  | Overspend; PM expected Underspend, so likely costs miscoded to this BU instead of BU 90861: PM to investigate and sort in 2017/18 |
| 90801 | SOUTH WEST 2FE EXPANSION T/P | 308,669 | 320,689 | $(12,020)$ | - | - | $(12,020)$ | - |  | Overspend on Silverdale expansion due to small discrepancy between planned and actual costs on PFI site; can now be closed off. |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90802 | NEW 5FE SEC SCH NE - WOODSIDE | 815,349 | 687,199 | 128,150 | 128,150 | - | - | - |  | Slippage due to delay in pre-construction services agreement (contract for design) being signed following on-going negotiations between SCC and Kier. Now resolved with no impact on the programme or delivery. |
| 90808 | ALDINE HOUSE UNDERCROFT AREA2 | 74,960 | 46,680 | 28,280 | 28,280 | - | - | - |  | Some Q60 effect + Slippage reason: delays as a result of Supplier subcontractor negotiations |
| 90809 | MANOR LODGE STRUCTURAL WORKS | 318,955 | 273,674 | 45,280 | - | - | - | 45,280 |  | Underspend reason: roof cost lower on inspection: project complete: return surplus to Q60/61 |
| 90857 | MECHANICAL REPLACE MOSSBROOK | 16,006 | 18,848 | $(2,842)$ | - | - | $(2,842)$ | - |  | overspend due to more works encountered on initial feasibility |
| 90858 | MECHANICAL REPLACE HALFWAY | 16,006 | 20,629 | $(4,622)$ | - | - | $(4,622)$ | - |  | overspend due to more works encountered on initial feasibility |
| 90859 | MECHANICAL REPLACE BRUNSWICK | 16,081 | 6,652 | 9,430 | - | - | - | 9,430 |  | Underspend due to less works encountered on initial feasibility |
| 90860 | MECHANICAL REPLACE BRADWAY | 16,081 | 18,291 | $(2,210)$ | - | - | $(2,210)$ | - |  | overspend due to more works encountered on initial feasibility |
| 90861 | ECCLESALL PERMANENT EXTENSION | 41,000 | 22,689 | 18,311 | 18,311 | - | - | - |  | Slippage required, as likely costs miscoded to BU 90798 instead of BU 90861: PM to investigate and sort in 2017/18 |
| 90862 | SILVERDALE PERMANENT EXTENSION | 545,023 | 472,264 | 72,760 | - | - | - | 72,760 |  | Underspend, as scheme now put on hold |
| 90863 | TOTLEY PRIMARY BULGE YR | 60,000 | 34,191 | 25,809 | - | - | - | 25,809 |  | Underspend due to budget being set prior to scope of scheme agreed; can now be closed per PM |
| 90864 | SPRINGFIELD PRIMARY BULGE YR | 147,095 | 137,315 | 9,780 | 9,780 | - | - | - |  | Slippage required for outstanding work to accommodate older children still being agreed |
| 90865 | TOTLEY PERM EXPN | 59,574 | 40,869 | 18,705 | 18,705 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: programme slippage only: for survey works |
| 90866 | ALDINE HOUSE- SECURITY MINDER | 135,906 | - | 135,906 | 135,906 | - | - | - |  | Goods delayed in shipment from China (DfE aware) |
| Q0060 | Building Maintenance -Primary Prioritisation Pgm | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | N/a |
| Q0061 | Basic Need | - | - | - | 870,339 | - | 199,570 | $(1,069,909)$ |  | Represents net Underspend of $£ 907 \mathrm{k}$ on Q60/61 funded projects; <br> to be returned to future year spend of Block Allocation |
| Total |  | 23,644,545 | 19,839,054 | 3,805,492 | 3,922,547 | $(162,342)$ | 9,065 | 36,221 | - |  |

HIGHWAYS

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Interna Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90703 | BLACKBURN VALLEY CYCLE ROUTE | 322,091 | 41,421 | 280,670 | 280,670 | - | - | - | 0.40 | Delays caused by very late (Dec 16) land compensation claim from land owner (delayed $£ 230 \mathrm{k}$ construction scheme) |
| 91611 | MS - IRR STAGES 2 \& 3 | 20,000 | 1,290 | 18,710 | 18,710 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 91662 | PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY | 113,000 | 111,480 | 1,520 | 1,520 | - | - | - | - | Minor Slippage |
| 92642 | BRIDGE STRENGTHENING WORKS | 133,373 | 64,006 | 69,366 | 69,366 | - | - | - | - | Network Rail did not do any design work on the bridges in our area (their priorities currently lie elsewhere) so no payments needed for their staff time in $16 / 17$ as profiled. The Structural Engineer has continued to undertake prep work and will continue to in 2017/18. Due to his work we are close to reaching an agreement with National Rail regarding the first scheme. |
| 92643 | STREETS AHEAD COMP WORKS | 48,889 | 17,836 | 31,053 | 31,053 | - | - | - | - | The speed cushions are now installed but the costs proved to be lower than expected. Also received a $£ 7 \mathrm{~K}$ contribution from Major Events Management as they arranged for the original cushions to be taken out as part of their Tour de France works. The remaining funding is still required to undertake capital works that, if undertaken at the same time as Streets Ahead, will produce significant cost benefits. |
| 92741 | PENISTONE RD, LIVESEY-LOWTHER | 293,003 | 297,146 | $(4,144)$ | - | - | $(4,144)$ | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 92769 | ACCIDENT SAVINGS SCHEMES | 30,253 | 16,179 | 14,073 | 14,073 | - | - | - | - | N.B. 16/17 spend on historical RSAs and Early Intervention, nothing on Firth Park |
| 92828 | SAFETY CAMERA DIGITAL UPGRADE | 570,480 | 552,447 | 18,033 | 18,033 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 92878 | UNIVERSITY CENTRAL CYCLE ROUTE | 43,000 | 38,362 | 4,638 | 4,638 | - | - | - | - | Minor slippage on feasibility expenditure |
| 92879 | CHATHAM STREET CYCLE SCHEME | 19,500 | 10,917 | 8,583 | 8,583 | - | - | - | - | Scheme unlikely to continue in current form: will become part of the IRR junction schemes. But slippage required to complete some initial design works |
| 92880 | HALLAM UNIVERSITY CYCLE ROUTE | 45,446 | 18,016 | 27,430 | 27,430 | - | - | - | - | Delays part caused by uncertainty around what was being delivered as part of City Centre development works. This has led to one section originally planned to be delivered by this project actually being delivered by development |
| 92882 | SHEAF VALLEY RIVERSIDE ROUTE | 47,000 | 41,659 | 5,342 | 5,342 | - | - | - | - | Minor slippage on initial phase. Completion expected Jul 17 |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92903 | LOWER DON VALLEY CYCLE ROUTE | 184,869 | 84,747 | 100,121 | 100,121 | - | - | - | - | Delays caused by flood alleviation works on Weedon Street bridge. |
| 92913 | LITTLE DON LINK (CYCLE ROUTE) | 55,125 | 55,501 | (376) | - | (376) | - | - | - | Slight acceleration of $17 / 18$ expenditure. |
| 92914 | GREEN ROUTES NETWORK | - | 4,236 | $(4,236)$ | Close | - | $(4,236)$ | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 92915 | DOUBLE YELLOW LINES | 42,502 | 36,640 | 5,862 | - | - | $(6,640)$ | 5,862 | 6,640 | Actually an overspend as $£ 42 \mathrm{~K}$ budget includes commuted sums, should only have been $£ 30 \mathrm{~K}$ and therefore no slippage. Overspend covered by final claim |
| 92918 | BANNER CROSS PARKING | 15,946 | 20 | 15,927 | 5,000 | - | - | - | 10,927 | Slippage element represents approved LTP allocation |
| 92933 | DARNALL CYCLE ROUTES | 28,500 | 15,865 | 12,635 | 12,635 | - | - | - | - | Minor slippage. Completion expected Nov <br> 17 |
| 92934 | COPPICE RISE CYCLE ROUTE | 21,766 | 15,913 | 5,853 | Close | - | - | 5,853 | - |  |
| 92935 | TRAM TRACK CYCLE SAFETY | 6,000 | 6,810 | (810) | - | (810) | - | - | - | Accelerated spend needs to reduce budget \& funding 17/18. Expecting further approvals for spend in $17 / 18$ which will be reduced by $£ 810$ |
| 93053 | PFI ACCESSIBLILTY ENHANCEMENTS | 308,896 | 345,139 | $(36,243)$ | - | $(36,243)$ | - | - | - | Accelerated spend needs to reduce budget \& funding 17/18 as Southey Green Road Scheme scheduled for 17/18 done 16/17 |
| 93095 | TAXI RANK IMPROVEMENTS | 18,235 | 17,495 | 740 | 740 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 93110 | BB2 CHESTERFIELD RD KBR | 1,300,000 | 997,856 | 302,144 | 302,144 | - | - | - | - | Delays caused on site by late start date for stats who are now on site. The PTE will issue a new order for $17 / 18$, any variation required as a result will be done then but works continuing |
| 93111 | NORTH SHEFFIELD BBA GROUP A | 31,180 | 38,506 | $(7,326)$ | - | - | $(7,326)$ | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 93112 | BB2 SHEFFIELD GLEADLESS KBR | 753,980 | 765,702 | (11,723) | - | - | (11,723) | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 93113 | BB2 CITY CENTRE PACKAGE | 168,932 | 176,038 | $(7,106)$ | - | $(7,106)$ | - | - | - | Minor acceleration on revised budget. |
| 93115 | LANGSETT/FORBES ROAD | 28,000 | 34,478 | $(6,478)$ | - | $(6,478)$ | - | - | - | Accelerated spend needs to reduce budget \& funding 17/18 |
| 93117 | NORTH SHEFFIELD BBA GROUP B | 971,253 | 763,663 | 207,590 | 207,590 | - | - | - | - | Delays caused on site at Barnsley Road schemes (two sites) one due to stats delays and one due to land ownership issues. All now on site. The PTE will issue a new order for $17 / 18$, any variation required as a result will be done then but works continuing |
| 93118 | NORTH SHEFFIELD BBA GROUP C | - | 35,546 | $(35,546)$ | 18,508 | - | - | - | $(54,054)$ | N.B. Group C North Sheffield Schemes ongoing so Group D (93119) slippage moved to C |
| 93119 | NORTH SHEFFIELD BBA GROUP D | 55,822 | 1,768 | 54,054 | Close | - | - | - | 54,054 | N.B. No Group D schemes continuing but as all North Sheffield, move slippage to Group B 93118 |
| 93350 | STREETS AHEAD OPPORTUNITIES | 336,318 | 333,502 | 2,816 | - | - | - | 2,816 | - | Minor Underspend |
| 93364 | HANDSWORTH-WAVERLY CYCLE LINK | 3,500 | 3,844 | (344) | - | - | (344) | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93370 | STREETS AHEAD RELATED CYCLE | - | 3,680 | $(3,680)$ | Close | - | $(3,680)$ | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 93371 | GREENHILL MAIN RD/G'HILL AVE | 42,189 | 42,920 | (731) | (731) | - | - | - | - | Minor delays slippage. |
| 93372 | ITS NETWORK MANAGEMENT | 170,500 | 102,064 | 68,436 | 63,296 | - | - | - | 5,140 | Delays caused by ITS staff having to work on other things, timescales set for the project is now known to be too ambitious. |
| 93373 | AIR QUALITY MONITOR EQUIPMENT | 192,000 | 180,932 | 11,068 | 11,068 | - | - | - | - | Minor slippage on installation works. |
| 93374 | IRR JUNCTION SCHEMES | 120,000 | 31,183 | 88,817 | 88,817 | - | - | - | - | Delays in commissioning modelling (now underway) for options testing |
| 93425 | RELOCATABLE CAMERA ENFORCEMNT | 27,058 | 1,558 | 25,500 | 25,500 | - | - | - | - | Now part of the Business Like Place project which is being progressed but hasn't started yet. |
| 93632 | SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR REVIEW | 60,000 | 54,860 | 5,140 | 5,140 | - | - | - | - | Minor slippage |
| 93633 | SKELTON LANE (ONE WAY) | 16,500 | 16,725 | (225) | - | (225) | - | - | - | N.B. Accelerated spend needs to reduce budget \& funding 17/18 |
| 93887 | BRT NORTH | 693,900 | 690,506 | 3,394 | - | - | - | 3,394 | - | N.B. All contributions from TTAPS have now been given |
| 93888 | BRT NORTH: HWYS ALTER'NS (WP24 | 48,635 | 37,013 | 11,622 | 11,622 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 93890 | BRT NORTH: ${ }^{\text {TINSLEY LINK (WP21 }}$ | 3,690,182 | 3,067,524 | 622,657 | 622,657 | - | - | - | - | Delays caused by further asbestos found on site and arrangements for removal have only just been agreed. Works are currently underway. |
| 94202 | KEY BUS RTE: SHEFF-WOODHOUSE | 20,920 | 21,205 | (285) | Close | - | (285) | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 94438 | RS AUDITS \& SCHEME COMPLETION | - | 1,339 | $(1,339)$ | Close | - | $(1,339)$ | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| 94445 | BN962 BUS AGREEMENT | 382,761 | 193,966 | 188,795 | - | - | - | 188,795 | - | Dykes Hall Road works planned now to be completed 17/18, Mansfield Road works planned Phase 1 only complete, Whetham Road works planned not undertaken, Holmes Lane works came in $£ 30 \mathrm{k}$ below budget. |
| 97982 | HGV ROUTING STRATEGY | 24,600 | 23,420 | 1,180 | 1,180 | - | - | - | - | Minor delays |
| 97985 | CITYWIDE 20MPH ZONE | 234,749 | 228,968 | 5,781 | 5,781 | - | - | - | - | Minor delays |
| 97986 | TRAFFIC CONTROLLER UPGRADES | - | 63,990 | $(63,990)$ | - | - | (63,990) | - | - |  |
| 97988 | CCTV PARKING ENFORCEMENT | 48,000 | 23,001 | 24,999 | 24,999 | - | - | - | - | Final delivery now expected 17/18 |
| 98000 | BODY CAMERAS | 22,803 | 24,010 | $(1,207)$ | Close | - | $(1,207)$ | - | - | Minor overspend funded in full by grant funding. |
| Total |  | 11,811,655 | 9,752,897 | 2,058,758 | 1,985,483 | (51,238) | (104,914) | 206,720 | 22,707 |  |

housing

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal <br> Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90136 | CHAUCER SQUARE MAINTENANCE | 18,000 | 13,092 | 4,909 | - | - | - | 4,909 |  | Underspend on annual allocation. |
| 94021 | PIPWORTH REC SUDS | 65,000 | 50,147 | 14,853 | 14,853 | - | - | - |  | Delay due to engineering and design issues and the need to deliver work in the dry season. |
| 97056 | WARM \& HEALTHY HOMES | 325,000 | 238,218 | 86,782 | - | - | - | 86,782 |  | Grant not claimed volume of work less than expected |
| 97127 | OBSOLETE HEATING | 3,300,263 | 3,411,429 | $(111,166)$ | - | - | $(111,166)$ | - |  | Increased expenditure on obsolete heating replacements has generated offsetting savings on the Emergency Replacement scheme |
| 97131 | ALMO ASBESTOS SURVEYS | 193,200 | 190,023 | 3,177 | - | - | - | 3,177 |  | Minor Underspend on completed project |
| 97139 | LANSDOWNE AND HANOVER CLADDING | - | 12,710 | $(12,710)$ | - | $(12,710)$ | - | - |  | This is to request a reduction of the 17-18 budget due to accelerated spend of $£ 12,710$ due to legal costs where work has been completed and costs have been challenged by leaseholders. |
| 97147 | ADAPTATIONS | 1,832,404 | 1,747,820 | 84,584 | 84,584 | - | - | - |  | Slippage required to fund remaining outstanding invoices under the Kier contract which ended on 31.3.2017. No outputs slipped. |
| 97150 | RHB LOANS HAL | 200,000 | 193,502 | 6,497 | - | - | - | 6,497 |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97153 | CALDERDALE RHB LOANS HAL | - | 85 | (85) | - | - | (85) | - |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97176 | BRADFORD RF FUNDS HAL | - | 6,298 | $(6,298)$ | - | - | $(6,298)$ | - |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97222 | PSH EMPTY PROPERTIES | 120,000 | 19,523 | 100,477 | - | - | - | 100,477 |  | Reduced Demand on Private Sector Housing |
| 97243 | YORK - NY SUB REGION HAL | 54,363 | 6,296 | 48,067 | 48,067 | - | - | - |  | This is outputs of 4 loans which were approved (legal charge in place) but where works were not completed and will now complete in 17/18. |
| 97264 | HEALTH \& SAFETY ENHANCE PROG | 195,368 | 206,862 | $(11,494)$ | - | $(11,494)$ | - | - |  | 3 more electrical reviews completed than planned. |
| 97269 | EMERGENCY DEMOLITIONS | 25,000 | 6,030 | 18,970 | - | - | - | 18,970 |  | Demand led programme. Savings on estimated costs. |
| 97282 | PARK HILL (STH) | 96,597 | 95,185 | 1,412 | 1,412 | - | - | - |  | Slippage required due to delays in handover of Phase 5 of the contract. |
| 97321 | PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT COSTS GF | 5,696,000 | 5,444,385 | 251,615 | - | - | - | 251,615 |  | Staff recharges lower than budget due to vacancies |
| 97333 | MINOR WORK GRANTS | 150,000 | 78,298 | 71,703 | - | - | - | 71,703 |  | Demand led programme. Saving on estimated costs |
| 97334 | DISABLED GRANTS | 3,058,441 | 2,591,707 | 466,734 | 340,504 | - | - | 126,230 |  | Slippage as this programme is led by referrals from health care professionals which is difficult to predict and requires time to authorise before grants are completed |
| 97338 | PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT COSTS RTB | - | 499,200 | $(499,200)$ | - | - | $(499,200)$ | - |  | Right To Buy Programme Management Costs funded from RTB Capital receipts each year |
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| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97340 | SWAN | 15,000 | 1,067 | 13,933 | 13,933 | - | - | - |  | Slippage to cover ongoing site maintenance, and any final compensation and Council Tax payments. |
| 97348 | HRA PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT | 250,000 | 201,688 | 48,312 | - | - | - | 48,312 |  | Staff recharges lower than budget due to vacancies |
| 97350 | ARBOURTHORNE 5MS | 1,048,913 | 901,459 | 147,454 | 10,000 | - | - | 137,454 |  | This is to cover outstanding compensation payments and any related fees. Disturbance payments can be claimed up to 7 years after rehousing. |
| 97355 | BRADFORD - WY SUB REGION HAL | 100,000 | - | 100,000 | - | - | - | 100,000 |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97390 | PHS ACTIVITY | 200,000 | 12,256 | 187,744 | - | - | - | 187,744 |  | Underspend on annual allocation. |
| 97391 | WAKEFIELD - WY SUB REGION HAL | - | 45,190 | $(45,190)$ | - | - | $(45,190)$ | - |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97394 | HULL - HUMBER SUB REGION HAL | 499,504 | 386,281 | 113,223 | 113,223 | - | - | - |  | Slippage for outputs of 12 loans which were approved (legal charge in place) but where works were not completed and will now complete in $17 / 18$. |
| 97395 | NE LINCS - SUB REGION HAL | 90,046 | 42,352 | 47,694 | - | - | - | 47,694 |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97396 | SCC RETAINED RETENTIONS | - | 26 | (26) | - | - | (26) | - |  | Incorrect recharge. Now corrected |
| 97404 | HEATING BREAKDOWNS | 1,000,000 | 506,257 | 493,743 | - | - | - | 493,743 |  | Significant reduction in emergency breakdown costs due to Obsolete Boiler Replacement scheme |
| 97405 | INSULATION (COUNCIL HSG) | 30,000 | 1,725 | 28,276 | 28,276 | - | - | - |  | Budget slipped as project for EWI has not yet received approval. This is now expected to start in 2017-18. Budget would have funded fees associated with tendering, therefore no outputs slipped. |
| 97409 | RECYCLING ROLL-OUT | 541,577 | 539,837 | 1,740 | - | - | - | 1,740 |  | Minor saving on annual costs |
| 97413 | SWEENY | 236,169 | 9,141 | 227,028 | - | - | - | 227,028 |  | Savings on scheme due to reduced depth of foundations required |
| 97414 | ARBOURTHORNE 5M'S REFURB | 900,000 | 1,219,756 | $(319,756)$ | - | - | $(319,756)$ | - |  | An expected saving of $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ on this prject was declared in 2015/16. This proved to be over optimistic resulting in the $£ 320 \mathrm{k}$ overspend in year but an approximate $£ 700 \mathrm{k}$ saving on the original approved budget. |
| 97416 | COMM HTG - PIPEWORK RENEWAL | - | $(45,548)$ | 45,548 | - | - | - | 45,548 |  | Saving on completed project. |
| 97418 | PITCHED ROOFING \& ROOFLINE | 22,672,841 | 19,863,535 | 2,809,306 | 2,809,306 | - | - | - |  | The slippage is due to progress issues with one of the contractors on the project. This has resulted in 800 outputs being slipped to 2017-18. |
| 97419 | FLAT ROOFING | 4,325,769 | 3,720,007 | 605,762 | 426,300 | - | - | 179,462 |  | The project is complete on site, however final claims from the contractor are still being negotiated. It is not expected all this budget will be required however an element of the budget needs to remain until final costs are known. |
| 97422 | NON HIGHWAYS RESPONSIVE WORKS | 21,200 | 10,054 | 11,146 | - | - | - | 11,146 |  | Underspend on annual allocation. |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97428 | SHEFFIELD HAL | 116,303 | - | 116,303 | 16,303 | - | - | 100,000 |  | Slippage of $£ 16,303$ to support an ongoing case where the scheme of works are only partially completed on site. This is a complex case where the client is in poor health. The required works to address a category one hazard were started but not completed to a satisfactory standard. In addition relationships between the client and the builder broke down resulting in a need to re-tender the work. The complications of resolving this issue have been exacerbated |
| 97429 | LTE'S PURCHASE \& REPAIR | 547,960 | 385,096 | 162,864 | 162,864 | - | - | - |  | Slippage of $£ 162,864$ has been requested for the 7th LTE which completed in April. 14 units will be purchased in $17 / 18$. The overall scheme budget for the 2017/18 is $£ 1,095,920$ for the acquisition of 14 LTE properties |
| 97434 | CROSS HOUSE ENABLING WORK | 2,103 | 1,827 | 276 | - | - | - | 276 |  | Underspend on completed Project. |
| 97435 | LTE'S REPAIRS AND REFURB CHS | 204,000 | 89,313 | 114,687 | 114,687 | - | - | - |  | Less outputs achieved than planned in 201617 hence Underspend. Procurement strategy being revised which is planned to increase outputs in line with budget. |
| 97437 | SPITAL HILL SHOP FRONTS | 2,451 | 1,821 | 630 | - | - | - | 630 |  | Minor Underspend on completed project |
| 97441 | COMMUNAL AREAS-LOW RISE FLATS | 5,766,190 | 5,809,199 | $(43,009)$ | - | $(43,009)$ | - | - |  | Slight acceleration on ongoing programme. |
| 97442 | KITCHEN/BATHRM PLANNED REPLMT | 6,581,068 | 5,905,746 | 675,322 | 675,322 | - | - | - |  | Less work required in properties than originally expected. As it was only the 1st year it is not yet known if this will result in an overall saving to the project therefore slippage is requested |
| 97443 | WINDOWS\& DOORS PLACEMENT(CHS) | 1,000,000 | 1,128,905 | $(128,905)$ | - | $(128,905)$ | - | - |  | Accelerated spend due to work being brought forward approx 64 properties. 2017-18 budget reduced accordingly. |
| 97444 | GENERAL/RTB ACQUISITIONS CHS | 1,540,000 | 1,263,978 | 276,023 | 276,023 | - | - | - |  | Slippage due to less properties than planned being purchased. Procurement strategy under review which is planned to increase purchases in line with budget. |
| 97448 | PROPERTY CONVERSIONS | 23,511 | 21,405 | 2,106 | - | - | - | 2,106 |  | Minor Underspend |
| 97449 | LONDON ROAD SHOP FRONTS | 498,374 | 465,030 | 33,345 | - | - | - | 33,345 |  | Underspend on completed investment project |
| 97450 | HILLSBOROUGH TOILETS | 60,000 | - | 60,000 | 60,000 | - | - | - |  | Full $£ 60 \mathrm{k}$ budget to be slipped into 2017/18, as no spend occurred in 2016/17. Owners of the Centre have not yet agreed to grant conditions or signed contract. Project on hold, pending this agreement. |
| 97452 | REGIONAL ERL | 20,000 | 20 | 19,980 | - | - | - | 19,980 |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal <br> Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97454 | MANOR TOP CENTRE | 10,000 | 18,374 | $(8,375)$ | - | $(8,375)$ | - | - |  | CAF to cover accelerated spend on design and survey fees in 16/17. The 2016/17 budget was $£ 10 \mathrm{k}$ and the final expenditure was $£ 18 \mathrm{k}$. 2017/18 budget to decrease from $£ 228 \mathrm{k}$ to £220k |
| 97456 | GARAGES STRATEGY - DEMOLITION | 328,750 | $(11,200)$ | 339,950 | 339,950 | - | - | - |  | Slippage due to late start on work following planning permission requests. Approx 450 outputs slipped as a result |
| 97501 | EP LOANS HULL | 142,849 | - | 142,849 | - | - | - | 142,849 |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97502 | EP NORTH EAST LINC | 313,805 | 266,105 | 47,700 | 47,700 | - | - | - |  | Slippage of $£ 47,699.45$ from the approved 16/17 budget into $17 / 18$, which is outputs of 2 loans which were approved (legal charge in place) but where works were not completed \& will now complete in 17/18. |
| 97503 | EP LOANS BRADFORD | - | 874 | (874) | - | - | (874) | - |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97505 | COMM EP NORTH EAST LINCS | 39,000 | 9,000 | 30,000 | - | - | - | 30,000 |  | Demand led loans scheme. Administered on behalf of other authorities. No impact on SCC funds |
| 97550 | SHC - NEW HOMES ACQUISITIONS | 6,500 | 5,600 | 900 | - | - | - | 900 |  | Minor Underspend |
| 97551 | COUNCIL HSG ACQUISITIONS PROG | 5,974,543 | 5,269,307 | 705,236 | 705,236 | - | - | - |  | 7 Acquisitions have slipped from 2016/17 to 2017/18 (3 General Acquisitions and 4 at Page Hall) from the overall target of 80 . |
| 97552 | NEW BUILD COUNCIL HSG PHASE 1 | 4,209,256 | 4,249,311 | $(40,056)$ | - | - | $(40,056)$ | - |  | Utilities have caused the contractor to claim an Extension of Time against SCC, which was responsible for organising diversions and relocations. In turn, following project completion, SCC will seek to make a claim against its utilities contractor, approvals for the 40k overspend sought and an additional 15 k for $17 / 18$ |
| 97553 | NEW BUILD COUNCIL HSG PHASE 2 | 99,579 | 56,072 | 43,507 | 43,507 | - | - | - |  | Alternative procurement routes continue to be explored and the specification has been revisited in an attempt to achieve better value for money. This will significantly delay the delivery of the scheme and therefore the budgets need to slip forward. |
| 97831 | EP NORTH WEST | - | (100) | 100 | - | - | - | 100 |  | Minor Underspend |
| 97834 | EP SOUTH EAST | 68,905 | 10,591 | 58,314 | 58,314 | - | - | - |  | To fund remaining works associated with CCTV works on Westfield. No outputs slipped as just remaining connection to be made. |
| 97835 | EP SOUTH WEST | - | (400) | 400 | - | - | 400 | - |  | Minor overspend funded from HRA resources |
| 97838 | COMPARTMENTALISATION - FS | 1,474,006 | 1,037,538 | 436,468 | 436,468 | - | - | - |  | Due to the affordability issues, responsive elements of the work were charged to Revenue for an amount of $£ 489,000$, resulting in an Underspend on Capital which needs to be carried forward into 17-18 to complete work to around 1500 properties. |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustmen | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97957 | SOUTH WEST - ABBEY BROOK | 62,431 | 24,029 | 38,402 | 38,402 | - | - | - |  | Budget required to fund outstanding final account costs and other unexpected claims on old projects. No outputs slipped. |
| 97961 | DH - METERING | 2,108,948 | 1,302,351 | 806,597 | 806,597 | - | - | - |  | Some work planned to be completed in 201617 has slipped to 2017-18. Bulk meter work instruction being finalised. |
| 97968 | LIFT MAINTENANCE \& REPAIR | 322,000 | 252,259 | 69,741 | - | - | - | 69,741 |  | Refurb of obsolete and repair of vandilised lifts saving on demand led element |
| 97989 | SPRINKLERS - FIRE SAFETY | 87,777 | 10,950 | 76,827 | 76,827 | - | - | - |  | 10 properties have not been accessed to complete the work and are currently going through legal proceedings. The work will be completed when this has been resolved. |
| 97990 | SHELTERED FIRE ALARM LINKING | 1,000,752 | 536,750 | 464,002 | 464,002 | - | - | - |  | Project started on site late and will now complete in 2017-18. Outputs of 690 slipped. |
| 98001 | FIRE SAFETY - HRA NON DOMESTIC | 36,133 | 19,745 | 16,388 | - | - | - | 16,388 |  | Underspend on completed project due to low tender prices |
| 98002 | ELECTRICAL STRATEGY | 12,500 | - | 12,500 | 12,500 | - | - | - |  | Slippage as no spend during 2016-17. Project has not yet commenced. No outputs slipped as budget was to cover tendering fees. |
| 97554 | NEW BUILD COUN HSG PH 3 | - | 1,679 | $(1,679)$ | - | $(1,679)$ | - | - |  | There was no budget forecast for 16/17, but $£ 1,679$ has been spent on Planning Delivery Service fees which will be deducted from the fees budget originally forecast for 17/18 |
| 97555 | NEW BUILD COUN HSG PH 4A | - | 11,754 | $(11,754)$ | - | $(11,754)$ | - | - |  | No budget forecast for 16/17, but 11,754 has been spent on Planning Delivery Service fees which will be deducted from the fees budget originally forecast for $17 / 18$ |
| 97556 | NEW BUILD COUN HSG PH 4B | - | 6,744 | $(6,744)$ | - | $(6,744)$ | - | - |  | No budget forecast for 16/17, but $£ 6,744$ has been spent on Planning Delivery Service fees which will be deducted from the fees budget originally forecast for 17/18 |
| Total |  | 79,920,348 | 70,375,564 | 9,544,784 | 8,225,160 | (224,671) | $(1,022,251)$ | 2,566,546 | - |  |

PARKS

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93410 | ANGRAM BANK PARK IMPROVEMENTS | 42,958 | 43,133 | (175) | Close | - | (175) | - | - | Minor Overspend funded by Section 106 allocation. |
| 93412 | CROOKES VALLEY PARKS | 15,465 | 137 | 15,329 | Close | - | - | 15,329 | - | Overall saving S106 allocation now available for Ponderosa Park |
| 93416 | OUSEBURN ROAD OPEN SPACE | 36,170 | 24,988 | 11,182 | 11,182 | - | - | - | - | Now expected to complete 17/18 |
| 93992 | RIVELIN VALLEY PLAYBUILDER | 7,170 | 7,150 | 20 | Close | - | - | 20 | - | Minor saving |
| 94121 | WINCOBANK HILL PHASE 1 | 4,443 | 1,970 | 2,473 | 2,473 | - | - | - | - | Slight delay to final costs |
| 94380 | MANOR FIELDS TODDLER PLAY | - | $(2,944)$ | 2,944 | Close | - | - | 2,944 | - | Minor saving |
| 94397 | PARK HILL GREEN LINKS | 28,760 | 12,736 | 16,024 | 15,714 | - | - | - | 310 | Now expected to complete 17/18 |
| 94463 | CLAY WOOD GREEN LINKS | 18,368 | 5,600 | 12,768 | 12,768 | - | - | - | 0 | Now expected to complete 17/18 |
| 94466 | WOODLANDS S106 | 38,925 | 38,925 | (0) | Close | - | (0) | - | - | Minor Overspend funded by S106 |
| 94469 | WINCOBANK HILL PHASE 2 | 8,401 | 8,403 | (2) | Close | - | (2) | - | - | Minor Overspend funded by existing RCC |
| 94470 | URBAN NATURE PARKS | 136,233 | 131,100 | 5,133 | N | - | - | 5,133 | - | Scope of work reduced to level of Forestry Commission funding |
| 94471 | DOUGLAS ROAD | 4,185 | - | 4,185 | Close | - | - | 4,185 | - | Works now part of Parkwood resolution Project |
| 94475 | BEIGHTON CLOSED LANDFILL | 97,966 | 66,581 | 31,385 | 31,385 | - | - | - | - | Because this is a gas field works are phased. Time is required between each phase to review impact before progressing. The work done so far has taken longer than expected, and it appears that some of what we thought were minor issues, may actually be more significant. |
| 94476 | BEIGHTON LEACHATE TREATMENT | 550,381 | 10,920 | 539,461 | 539,461 | - | - | - | - | When the project was tendered, it was evident that the project would be more complex and costly that originally advised by the appointed consultants; the costs being greater than those outlined in their reports. Reengineering of the site's leachate infrastructure is taking place to make the original lagoon and wetland project scheme economically viable. Once this work is done, the lagoon and wetland option with be assessed again. The reengineering work is likely to take 6 to 8 months. |
| 94477 | PARKWOOD RESOLUTION SITE | 315,006 | 26,336 | 288,670 | 288,670 | - | - | - | - | When the project was tendered, returns were 100 k over budget so a main contractor hasn't been appointed yet, and none of the main project works have started. Value engineering works required. |
| 94487 | CHARNOCK REC'N GROUND MUGA | 4,338 | 4,213 | 125 | Close | - | - | 125 | - | Minor Saving |
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| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94490 | CATHERINE STREET OPEN SPACE | 5,770 | 5,982 | (212) | Close | - | (212) | - | - | Minor overspend funded by existing Revenue Contribution |
| 94492 | RETHINKING PARSON CROSS PARK | 362 | (138) | 500 | - | - | - | 500 | - | Minor Saving |
| 94493 | MOVE MORE RUNNING ROUTES | 62,043 | 44,140 | 17,903 | 17,903 | - | - | - | - | Final phase of prject now slipping into 17/18 |
| 94494 | BOTANICAL GARDENS EDUCATION | 618,128 | 580,156 | 37,973 | 37,973 | - | - | - | (0) | The contractors work programme was over ambitious and delays were experienced in the project delivery. The negotiations regarding the final valuation are ongoing causing a delay in payment. |
| 94495 | LADY CANNINGS PLANTATION TRACK | 1,322 | 3,530 | $(2,208)$ | Close | - | $(2,208)$ | - | - | Minor Overspend funded by Revenue Contribution |
| 94496 | WOODTHORPE RECREATION GROUND | 20,144 | 18,679 | 1,465 | 1,465 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 94497 | SHEFFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY HLF | 319,645 | 162,650 | 156,995 | 156,995 | - | - | - | 0 | Revisions in the tender package took the work over the OJEU threshold resulting in an extended tender period. Undertaking unforeseen ground investigation and historic research is extending the project timescale beyond the original forecast |
| 94502 | REDMIRES PITCH DRAINAGE | 10,058 | 10,227 | (169) | Close | - | (169) | - | - | Minor Overspend funded by Revenue Contribution |
| 94503 | GRAVES PARK IMP. PROJECT | 46,105 | 10,715 | 35,390 | 35,390 | - | - | - | - | Path works now to be undertaken in AprilJune 17 to take advantage of measured term contract savings. |
| 94504 | GREENHILL PARK IMPROVEMENTS | 31,491 | 30,861 | 630 | 125 | - | - | 505 | - |  |
| 94505 | DORE REC PITCH DRAINAGE | - | 275 | (275) | N/A | (275) | - | - | - | Funded by S106 allocated agreements reducing what's available for 17/18 |
| 94506 | GRAVES AND MILLHOUSE COURTS | 149,756 | 139,090 | 10,666 | 9,722 | - | - | - | 944 | Slippage in relation to final payments due on scheme. |
| 94507 | BINGHAM COURTS | 2,140 | 1,614 | 526 | 526 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 94509 | BENTS GREEN PITCH S106 | 32,160 | 2,767 | 29,393 | 29,393 | - | - | - | - | Delay in spend due to contractor availability, unable to fit in the work before the winter season and can't do the works over winter due to ground conditions. |
| 94513 | ECB PITCHES | 143,350 | 127,934 | 15,416 | 15,416 | - | - | - | - | Slippage in relation to final payments due on scheme. |
| 94516 | COLLEY PARK IMPROVEMENTS | - | 1,275 | $(1,275)$ | $(1,275)$ | - | - | - | - | Accelerated expenditure Funded by S106 allocated agreements reducing what's available for $17 / 18$ |
| 94518 | MILLHOUSES PARK BASKETBALL | 13,700 | 13,696 | 4 | Close | - | - | 4 | - | Minor Saving |
| 97946 | PARKWOOD SPRINGS CYCLE TRACK | 3,876 | 4,970 | $(1,094)$ | Close | - | $(1,094)$ | - | - | Minor overspend covered by existing grant funding. No additional call on SCC Resources |
| Q0093 | GREEN AND OPEN SPACES 5106 STRATE | 29,957 | - | 29,957 | N/A | - | - | - | 29,957 | N.B. Holding code for S106 Parks Programme, now profiled in 17/18 |
| Total |  | 2,798,778 | 1,537,671 | 1,261,107 | 1,205,285 | (275) | $(3,860)$ | 28,745 | 31,212 |  |
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| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92459 | WOODSIDE OPEN SPACE | 20,415 | 17,098 | 3,317 | 3,317 | - | - | - |  | It has been agreed not to submit the planning application for Woodside New Open Space until the above work is complete. Remaining spend includes small amount of work to prepare the planning application, a final cost estimate and planning application fee. |
| 92460 | CIL | - | 660 | (660) | - | - | (660) | - |  | Payment represents statutory transfer of Community Infrastructure Levy to Parish Council |
| 94508 | CASTLE COLLEGE GREEN LINK | 19,521 | 5,750 | 13,771 | 13,771 | - | - | - |  | The Green Link between Shrewsbury Rd and the Kier Housing site has not yet been completed. Design is approved and Kier will complete in the first few months of 2017/2018 - these works are the last phase on site. |
| Total |  | 39,936 | 23,507 | 16,429 | 17,088 | - | (660) | - | - |  |

RESOURCES

| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90027 | DARNALL FRA WORKS | 16,517 | 6,571 | 9,946 | - | - | - | 9,946 |  | Underspend reason: Scheme complete, small variance can close \& return to Q73 |
| 90065 | RADON WORKS | 39,438 | 8,868 | 30,570 | 30,570 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: awaiting Radon Survey Information to identify future schemes |
| 90066 | CENTRAL LIBRARY | 74,476 | - | 74,476 | - | - | - | 74,476 |  | Underspend: not now required due to uncertainty of library future: close |
| 90067 | TREE MANAGEMENT PROG | 37,755 | 30,344 | 7,411 | 7,411 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: dependent upon information from Parks: to be spent in 17/18 |
| 90068 | CLOSED PROPERTIES PROG | 100,000 | 58,596 | 41,404 | 41,404 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: retained funding to manage vacant properties in 17/18 |
| 90071 | ROOFING PROG | 9,000 | 9,238 | (238) | - | - | (238) | - |  | Small o/spend \& close: Work to be taken forward in 93481-Roofing works as part of the CBERP (Corporate Buildings Essential Replacement Programme). Can be closed. /Q73N/A? |
| 90072 | RESURFACING (INC PARKS) PROG | 499,000 | 483,291 | 15,709 | 15,709 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: Programme slippage (to April 17) only, no affect on overall project cost |
| 90074 | CITY RD CEMETERY + CREM | 13,500 | 3,500 | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | - | - |  | Operational delay: work undertaken by Amey in Apr 17 |
| 90076 | DAMS \& WATER COURSES PROG | 156,272 | 124,771 | 31,501 | 31,501 | - | - | - |  | Variation to slip $£ 31,501.00$ into April of 17/18 for Works not yet completed.... with $£ 5 \mathrm{k}$ retention element held in April until resolved |
| 90077 | BOTANICAL GDS PUBLIC TOILETS | 21,000 | 11,774 | 9,226 | 9,226 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: Delay to start on site due to requirement for a license from Botanical Gardens Trust. |
| 90079 | CARBROOK UTC RELOCATION | 130,799 | 60,673 | 70,126 | - | - | - | 70,126 |  | Overall Workplace u/spend; but keep open for Retention |
| 90080 | STANIFORTH WORKS FRA (R) | 388,021 | 302,910 | 85,110 | - | - | - | 85,110 |  | Underspend reason: significant omission of provisional sum requirements and construction CAF not being reduced following contract award. Keep Open: Retention |
| 90081 | FRA 15-16 STOCKSBRIDGE YC [R] | 99,814 | 74,160 | 25,654 | 5,654 | - | - | 20,000 |  | Underspend due to omission of provisional sums not required / Slippage required for Works not yet completed |
| 90082 | FRA 15-16 BISHOPS HOUSE M [R] | 48,110 | 39,107 | 9,003 | - | - | - | 9,003 |  | U/Spend reason: $£ 3 \mathrm{k}$ savings on fees, $£ 2 \mathrm{k}$ on Works and $£ 4 k$ unused contingency |
| 90083 | FRA 15-16 FIRTH PK CLK TWR [R] | 105,039 | 82,277 | 22,762 | 2,762 | - | - | 20,000 |  | To slip £2,762.13 into 17/18 for Works not yet completed and $£ 20 \mathrm{k}$ Underspend due to omission of provisional sums not required. |
| 90086 | ASBESTOS REMOVAL FRAMEWORK | 150,000 | 22,999 | 127,001 | 127,001 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: required for Emergency Asbestos Removal work and fees |


| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90087 | HR+M TRANSPORT | 4,506,109 | 4,347,294 | 158,815 | 158,815 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: Vehicles not ordered in $16 / 17$ due to lack of information around fleet requirements. Intel to be gathered and vehicles purchased in $17 / 18$. |
| 90091 | MECHANICAL REPLACEMENT PROG | 1,000,000 | 882,301 | 117,699 | 117,699 | - | - | - |  | Full year allocation approved in Nov 16. Despite in-year acceleration, full year expenditure unachieved in 5 m available |
| 90092 | ELECTRICAL REPLACEMENT PROG | 100,000 | 71,166 | 28,834 | 28,834 | - | - | - |  | Full year allocation approved in Nov 16. Despite in-year acceleration, full year expenditure unachieved in 5 m available |
| 90093 | LIFT REPLACEMENT PROG | 150,000 | 48,794 | 101,206 | 101,206 | - | - | - |  | Full year allocation approved in Nov 16. Despite in-year acceleration, full year expenditure unachieved in 5 m available |
| 90094 | ROOFING REPLACEMENT PROG | 175,000 | 152,994 | 22,007 | 22,007 | - | - | - |  | Full year allocation approved in Nov 16. Despite in-year acceleration, full year expenditure unachieved in 5 m available |
| 90095 | WINDOW \& DOOR REPLACEMENT PROG | 275,000 | 197,011 | 77,989 | 77,989 | - | - | - |  | Full year allocation approved in Nov 16. Despite in-year acceleration, full year expenditure unachieved in 5 m available |
| 90096 | STRUCTURAL DEFECTS PROGRAMME | 125,000 | 121,153 | 3,847 | 3,847 | - | - | - |  | Full year allocation approved in Nov 16. Despite in-year acceleration, full year expenditure unachieved in 5 m available |
| 90097 | DAMS \& WATERCOURSES PHASE 2 | 53,000 | 15,254 | 37,746 | 37,746 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: tender delay resulting from need to obtain additional ecological surveys |
| 90120 | MOORFOOT | 8,739 | 42,889 | $(34,149)$ | - | - | $(34,149)$ | - |  | Overall Workplace Programme Underspend \& close |
| 90133 | HOWDEN HOUSE ACCOMM STRATEGY | 86,029 | 103,555 | $(17,526)$ | - | - | $(17,526)$ | - |  | Overall Workplace Programme Underspend \& close |
| 90140 | PROJECT DELIVERY COSTS | 216,184 | 71,840 | 144,345 | - | - | - | 144,345 |  | Overall Workplace Programme Underspend \& close |
| 90141 | IT WORKSTREAMS | 128,800 | 19,759 | 109,042 | 30,000 | - | - | 79,042 |  | Overall Workplace u/spend \& $£ 30 \mathrm{k}$ slippage: PM confirmed |
| 90144 | ABBEYDALE IND HAM-STRUCT DEF | 52,980 | 10,611 | 42,369 | 42,369 | - | - | - |  | Programme slippage only, no affect on overall project cost, variance should be zero following April payment |
| 90145 | PARK LIBRARY/COMM ROOF RENEWAL | 144,510 | 52,497 | 92,013 | - | - | - | 92,013 |  | Underspend reason: $£ 77 \mathrm{k}$ on contracted works and $£ 15 \mathrm{k}$ fees: Scheme complete, variance can return funds to Q73 |
| 90147 | MEDICO LEGAL FRA | 399,266 | 215,194 | 184,072 | 184,072 | - | - | - |  | Programme slippage only following liaising with Centre Manager - delayed at client request(Nov --> Mar SOS) |
| 90148 | STOCKSBRIDGE LIBRARY FRA | 170,325 | 154,055 | 16,270 | - | - | - | 16,270 |  | Underspend reason: Scheme complete; can return funds to Q73 |
| 90149 | TOWN HALL PROJECT | 73,320 | 23,349 | 49,971 | 49,971 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: First phase of feasibilities complete, more work to follow in 17/18 (decant feasibility study). |
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| Project Number | Scheme Title | Approved Expenditure Budget | OEO Expenditure 31/03/16 (Qtier) | Variance | Slippage | Accelerated Spend | Overspend | Underspend | Internal Adjustment | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90151 | MOORFOOT PHASE 3 | - | $(20,788)$ | 20,788 | - | - | - | 20,788 |  | Overall Workplace Programme Underspend \& close |
| 90152 | GRANGE CRESCENT FRA (R) | 199,357 | 97,423 | 101,934 | - | - | - | 101,934 |  | U/Spend reason: due to significant omission of provisional sums and construction CAF not being reduced following contract award |
| 90153 | VERDON STREET FRA (R) | 55,870 | 53,432 | 2,438 | - | - | - | 2,438 |  | U/Spend reason: due to significant omission of provisional sums and construction CAF not being reduced following contract award. |
| 90154 | WARMINSTER HOSTEL FRA (R) | 206,690 | 138,307 | 68,383 | - | - | - | 68,383 |  | U/Spend reason: due to significant omission of provisional sums and construction CAF not being reduced following contract award. |
| 90155 | STRADBROKE YC FRA (R) | 24,369 | 1,189 | 23,180 | 23,180 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: Works not yet completed. Delay due to incorporation of this site into batch 3 contract (due to CSSR contract coming to an end). |
| 90156 | ADLINGTON ROAD CC FRA (R) | 55,290 | 4,387 | 50,903 | 50,903 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: Works not yet completed. Delay due to incorporation of this site into batch 3 contract (due to CSSR contract coming to an end). |
| 90157 | COLLEGIATE CRESCENT FRA (R) | 55,285 | 9,486 | 45,799 | - | - | - | 45,799 |  | Underspend reason: Fees / survey costs spent on project, but now on hold as site to be soldinstead. |
| 90159 | FRA WORKS 16-17 | 2,004,987 | 151,721 | 1,853,267 | 1,853,267 | - | - | - |  | Asbestos survey delays, main contractor delays and changes in priorities of various sites |
| 90856 | MECHANICAL REPLACEMENT MTC | 48,000 | 125,177 | $(77,177)$ | - | $(77,177)$ | - | - |  | Acceleration due to design work being done up front to reflect change in programme priorities |
| 92356 | MILLENIUM GALLERY LIFE CYCLE | 5,619 | 997 | 4,622 | 4,622 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: to be added to current Corporate Resource Pool funded 17/18 lifecycle works |
| 94362 | BROOMHILL LIBRARY | 100,000 | 86,340 | 13,660 | 13,660 | - | - | - |  | Slippage reason: delays from weather and additional works on site. |
| 93480 | CBER-ELECTRICAL 17-19 | - | 1,000 | $(1,000)$ | - | $(1,000)$ | - | - |  | $£ 1 \mathrm{k}$ accel'n due to Commercial Services fees |
| 93486 | CBER-DAMS \& WATERCOURSES17-19 | - | 1,000 | $(1,000)$ | - | $(1,000)$ | - | - |  | £1k accel'n due to Commercial Services fees |
| 97899 | PATH RESURFACING PROGRAMME | 40,640 | 0 | 40,640 | - | - | - | 40,640 |  | Underspend reason: Scheme complete, variance can be closed: previously slipped amount not now required. |
| 97941 | CBT WINCOBANK COMMUNITY BLDG | - | (0) | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |  | Close: PM confirmed |
| Q0073 | HEALTH \& SAFETY COMPLIANCE | 393,105 | - | 393,105 | 864,000 | - | - | $(470,895)$ |  | Awaiting specification of Resources Fire Risk Assessment Mitigation Works; $£ 864 \mathrm{k}$ total slippage represents $£ 393 \mathrm{k}$ slippage carried forward, plus a net Underspend of $£ 470 \mathrm{k}$ on Q73 funded projects to be returned to future year spend of Block Allocation |
| Total |  | 12,742,216 | 8,498,465 | 4,243,751 | 3,945,425 | $(79,177)$ | $(51,913)$ | 429,417 | - |  |


[^0]:    * Included in the 'Under 12 month' figure are bank loans which have a "call option" that allows the bank to either re-set the interest rate or allow us to repay the loan every six months. As these loans could be repayable in six months'time, we show them as being due under a year.

