

DRAFT

**Oxfordshire County Council
Corporate Asset Management Plan**

2009/10 – 2013/14

	Page
Introduction	
• Purpose	2
• Structure	2
The Property Portfolio	3
Corporate Objectives and Priorities	3
Key Property Objectives	4
Major Growth Areas	11
Performance Indicator Targets and Benchmarking	13
Processes for Effective Asset Management	13
Involvement of Stakeholders	13
Partnership Working	14

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Property Portfolio Summary

Appendix 2 – Corporate and Service Priorities with Significant Asset Implications

- Corporate Priorities
- Children, Young People & Families
- Community Safety
- Environment & Economy
- Social & Community Services

Appendix 3 – Properties identified as ‘Unfit for Purpose’

Appendix 4 – Asset Management Improvement Plan

Introduction

Purpose of the Corporate Asset Management Plan

1. The Corporate Asset Management Plan (AMP) sets out the Council's current and future property asset needs that arise from the Council's corporate and service priorities and the Council's approach to meeting those needs.
2. The AMP will aid effective strategic planning by setting out the Council's property strategy and providing a basis on which to make property and investment decisions, thereby enabling effective service delivery and helping the authority meet its target of 90% of property being Fit for Purpose by 2015. The Council also prepares a Capital Strategy which is directly linked to the AMP and is prepared and approved at the same time. The Capital Strategy responds to the needs identified in the AMP and establishes a strategy for financing those needs.
3. The AMP focuses on outputs, for example improved Fitness for Purpose; and outcomes, such as better achievement of corporate objectives and improved services.
4. Preparation has involved all service directorates and the Capital Steering and Working Groups, reflecting the fact that the whole organisation needs to be involved and that the Plan will only be an effective asset management tool if it involves and is used by the whole organisation. The plan will be considered by the Cabinet and Council.
5. The Plan looks in detail at 2009/10 to 2013/14 to allow forward planning and integration with the Council's service and resource planning process, and Medium Term Financial Plan but also considers longer term asset needs.

Structure of the AMP

6. The AMP sets out the key features of the Council's property portfolio. It gives the Council's objectives, major corporate and service priorities and resulting asset implications for the next 5 years in detail and also looks at longer term needs. The Plan identifies the Property Objectives which the Council needs to meet in order to achieve its corporate and service priorities.
7. The main processes the Council has in place to allow for effective management of its assets are explained and an Asset Management Improvement Plan sets out the actions required to make improvements and takes into account current guidance on best practice, including the 'Framework for Local Authority Asset Management' prepared by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the RICS Guidance on Asset Management. The County Council's asset management arrangements meet the majority of the recommendations and those areas where further work is required are identified in the Asset Management Improvement Plan (Appendix 4).
8. Performance against national and local property indicators is used to monitor the performance of the property portfolio and is along with benchmarking information

and targets for future performance is included in the annual report to the Cabinet on the Property Portfolio, which is considered in October.

The Property Portfolio

9. The Council has 846 properties recorded on the Council's property database with an asset value in the region of £1.34 billion. A breakdown of the Council's property at October 2008 is given in Appendix 1.
10. A range of initiatives are being undertaken to improve the Council's property and to ensure it effectively supports and enhances service delivery. In 2006 Fitness for Purpose surveys were undertaken for non-school property for the first time to enable a more objective view of the portfolio to be taken and to help target future investment. The 2007 results were (2006 results in brackets):
 - 43% (39%) Fit for Purpose;
 - 37% (31%) Generally Fit for Purpose;
 - 13% (11%) Unfit for Purpose with scope for economic improvement;
 - 2% (4%) Unfit for Purpose.
11. Many of the schemes already within the Capital Programme, the Repairs and Maintenance Programme, the Access Programme and energy schemes will address fitness for purpose issues. In addition, the implementation of the Better Offices Programme will increase the number of Fit for Purpose offices from 20% to 60%. The Better Offices Programme is progressing on programme with new, fit for purpose offices now established in east Oxford (Knights Court) and the southern area (Windrush Court) with the disposal of poor quality office accommodation at Tyndale House (Cowley Road), Crown House (Cowley Road), Yarnton House (Yarnton) and 61a High Street (Wallingford).
12. Those properties identified as Unfit for Purpose are listed in Appendix 3. The action being taken for each property is shown.

Corporate Objectives and Priorities

13. The AMP has been prepared on the basis of Corporate Objectives, and the priority themes from the Oxfordshire Plan 2008/12 and from emerging Business Plan Priorities for 2009/10 onwards. The property asset implications arising from these plans are set out in Appendix 2. The Appendix shows the corporate objective that each priority is linked and contributes to.
14. The Council's Corporate Objectives are:
 - "low taxes, real choice, value for money"
15. The Council's highest priorities are within four themes:
 - World Class Economy
 - Environment and Climate Change
 - Healthy and Thriving Communities
 - Better Public Services

16. The specific challenges under these themes are:

World Class Economy

- Improving our skills base at all levels and encouraging ambition in those areas where there is a generational lack of aspiration
- Widening labour market participation
- Investing in infrastructure - roads, schools, affordable housing
- Securing a better match between housing and economic growth
- Planning for successful and sustainable development of our growth areas
- Developing technology clusters and the sustainability of the rural economy
- Tackling social exclusion
- Maintaining a world-class environment while encouraging economic growth

The Environment and Climate Change

- Making our contribution to the global challenge of climate change
- Improving the street scene and enhancing the environment
- Dealing with the environmental impact of population growth while maintaining the character of our towns and villages and the Green Belt around Oxford City.
- The potential challenge of the proposed new reservoir
- Reducing waste going to landfill for environmental and economic reasons

Healthy and Thriving Communities:

- Breaking the cycle of deprivation
- Responding to demographic change
- Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour
- Maintaining the energy and cultural vibrancy of our City, market towns and rural communities
- Supporting older people and people with physical or learning disabilities to maintain their health and independence
- Reducing gaps in health inequality
- Engaging with the public, private and voluntary sectors to deliver joined up, responsive public services that meet local needs

Better Public Services

- Reducing the burden of Council Tax
- Providing what customers want
- Maintaining and improving the quality of our services

Key Property Objectives

17. The Key Property Objectives are given below. Their purpose is to set out what needs to be done in terms of the Council's assets to help the Council deliver its Corporate Objectives and Strategic Priorities. The Objectives will be used as criteria in establishing priorities for the Capital Programme.

18. There will need to be continued change to and the improvement of the Council's property assets which will require significant capital and revenue investment. The Key Objectives are:

- for 90% of the Council's property to be fit for purpose by 2015;
- improvements to the condition of the Council's property and a reduction in the maintenance backlog to a sustainable level;
- improvements in office accommodation and the introduction of modern workstyle across the County by implementing the Better Offices Programme;
- reducing the Council's Carbon Footprint;
- provision of suitable property to enable improvements in adult social care;
- addressing inadequate library services, particularly in Thame, Oxford Central Library, Banbury, Bicester and Headington;
- improvements in the condition and suitability of youth centres;
- improvements in facilities to increase the re-use and recycling of waste;
- modernisation and improvement of schools in accordance with the Education Asset Management Plan;
- improving access to our buildings for people with disabilities

19. For each objective an explanation is given below of how it contributes to the Council's Corporate Objectives and Priorities, what needs to be done to achieve the priority, how it will be done and what resources are available or funding is required.

90% of Property Fit for Purpose by 2015

20. This is an Environment & Economy priority. Meeting this target will assist in the delivery of effective services and therefore in meeting the Council's priorities. 43% of non-school property is rated as Fit for Purpose. 2% of properties are identified as unfit for purpose. These are listed in Appendix 3 and the action proposed for each property is shown. Analysis is underway to develop proposals for properties which fall within the 'Unfit for Purpose with potential for Economic Improvement' and 'Generally Fit for Purpose' categories.

21. Implementation of the Better Offices Programme will increase the number of Fit for Purpose offices from 20% to 60%. The Programme is currently 50% complete.

22. It is not currently possible to quantify the resources required to achieve this priority but many of the schemes already within the Capital Programme, the repairs and maintenance programme, the Access Programme and energy schemes will address fitness for purpose issues. The next full survey of property will take place early in 2009.

Improvements to the Condition of the Council's Property

23. Property is required to deliver all of the Council's services and it needs to be in an appropriate condition to allow the effective delivery of services. In 2007/08 the Council had assessed the need for repair and maintenance to its buildings at nearly £74.3 million, down from £78m in 2006/07, a drop of 4.7%. There had been an annual rise in this figure up to 2004/05 (£83.5 million) despite an annual

investment of approximately £4 million. The rise has been halted by a £25 million additional investment in repairs and maintenance over the period 2005/06 to 2010/11.

24. It is necessary to commence planning for the end of the prudential funding period in 2010/11, as if investment in repairs and maintenance falls to previous levels, the assessed need may start to rise again.
25. There are other initiatives which will address assessed needs, including the Better Offices Programme, Building Schools for the Future, the Primary Capital Programme and some schemes in the Capital Programme.
26. The Fitness for Purpose Surveys include condition information therefore targeting of property in the lowest fitness for purpose categories will also help to address assessed need.

Improvements in Office Accommodation

27. The Better Offices Programme (BOP) will make extensive improvements to the quality of office accommodation which will make a significant contribution to the provision of high quality services and therefore support the Corporate Objective of providing value for money. Improved environmental performance will also contribute to the Council's Future First objective - the priority theme of the Environment and Climate Change.
28. The Better Offices Programme will be implemented by the end of 2009. This is a major change programme that will affect nearly 2,000 staff and make a major contribution to the Change Agenda. There is a Programme Board and Implementation Group in place to ensure effective delivery. The Business Case covers a 29-year period and includes all relevant costs and savings. The Programme includes an investment of £14.8m. Despite realising capital receipts of £13 million and revenue savings, the Programme will require revenue investment in the early years.

Reducing the Council's Carbon Footprint

29. This contributes to the corporate objective of low taxes and the Priority theme of The Environment and Climate Change. The County Council is part of the Carbon Trust Local Authority Carbon Management Programme. Capital investment has now been provided which will be match funded through the SALIX programme and this will help to secure improvements to the environmental performance of property and cost savings with short term payback. The fund will be replenished from savings, ensuring that there is an ongoing source of funding for schemes that reduce the Council's Carbon Footprint.

Improving Adult Social Care

30. Improvements in adult social care are required to contribute to the theme of Stronger and Safer Communities and the corporate objectives of low taxes, real choice and value for money. The need for improvements relate to residential care for those with physical and learning disabilities; day care for those with

learning disabilities; day care for older people and Homes for Older People. These are detailed in 2.

Residential Accommodation for Adults with a Physical Disability and Acquired Brain Injury

31. Accommodation will be provided through partner organisations but land would need to be provided through the County Council. The need identified is for about 30 units of accommodation a year.
32. If land is provided for these units it will have resource implications as capital receipts will be lost. But there will be revenue savings.
33. This is an identified need either from demography, accident statistics and known clients with existing unmet need.

Residential Accommodation for Adults with Learning Disabilities

34. This strategy aims to provide Supported Living accommodation through partnership with Registered Social Landlords.
35. The aim is to provide purpose built accommodation to increase the independence of adults with learning disabilities.
36. There will be a continuing need for purpose built premises and this is identified in the Learning Disability Housing Strategy.

Homes for Older People

37. Work is continuing with the Order of St. John (OSJ) to re-provide the homes in Banbury, Bicester, Chipping Norton and Thame. The funding for the new homes is largely provided within the funding strategy for HoPs.
38. The remaining 8 homes within which OSJ provide a service need to be reviewed in the context of changing needs. These homes are listed in Appendix 2. The Resource Implications are not yet known.
39. The Extra Care Housing strategy is one avenue for the redevelopment and re-provision of services in these homes. However, there is also a need to enable the development of Extra Care Housing throughout the County.

Mental Health Housing

40. This is an emerging strategy. The need is to replace residential accommodation with housing within the community, similar to the strategy for adults with learning disabilities.

Day Services

41. Whilst each service does have some need for specific facilities in order to support its users this does not have to be met in a stand alone building. In many smaller

population areas there are distinctive service advantages to sharing buildings such as community centres.

Day Service for Adults with Learning Disabilities

42. The aim is to develop day services through a countywide distribution of care and resource bases.
43. In addition there is now a need to re-provide the bases established in Headington and Cowley as this are no longer suitable to meet the changing needs of the clients.

Day Centres for Older People

44. The type of day centres needs to change to meet the objectives of the Day Service Strategy to support people to live in their own homes. The proposal is over the next 5 years to create 10 resource centres either through upgrading and replacing existing day centres or new build. Bicester has already been achieved, Banbury is at the feasibility stage. It is possible that some development will be possible as part of or alongside extra care housing developments or emerge out of the new strategic sites developments. Increasingly there will be a need to link to health related services, currently provided in community hospitals.

Day Services for Mental Health

45. This service is primarily provided by partner providers on a mixture of rented and county owned premises. This services need to be located in centres of population but can share existing locations such as community centres. There is a current need to find a location for a centre in Cowley.

Future Needs

46. There will be significant pressures arising from the demographic pressures on services for older people. A substantial amount of work is underway in quantifying the capital requirements.
47. The major issues that have to be considered at this stage are:
 - Funding and managing major service transition. Care and support of people in services for older people has to continue while the new services are developed. This transition will require hump or time limited additional funding. This could be financed from capital
 - The use of County Council land and other assets in the development of facilities. For sheltered and extra care housing this will be particularly important for drawing down any grant support from the Housing Corporation, reducing the long term revenue costs, and ensuring that the County is able to get the best advantage from any section 106 arrangements and being able to ensure that there are nominations agreements in place that will allow our priorities to be met.

Both of these issues are very evident for the extra care housing strategy.

Addressing Inadequate Library Services

48. Improving inadequate libraries will help to achieve a real choice of access to leisure and services in a way that does not prejudice the future of our environment.
49. The priorities are Thame, Oxford Central Library, Banbury, Bicester and Headington.

Thame

50. A scheme for replacement of Thame Library is being progressed.

Oxford Central Library

51. It is intended that the Central Library will be extensively refurbished as part of third party proposals to redevelop the Westgate Centre, however these proposals have been put on hold by the developer.

Banbury

52. Funding of £2.5m has been allocated. The current library is in unsuitable leased accommodation in a poor location.

Bicester

53. A scheme to re-provide the library within a town centre redevelopment scheme is being progressed with Cherwell District Council. The library scheme will be funded by an allocation in the Capital Programme, a capital receipt from the sale of the existing site and developer contributions. The town centre redevelopment has been delayed.

Headington Library

54. A scheme has been developed to address accessibility and suitability issues with the library and is being discussed with Oxford City Council who own the freehold of the building and who are therefore liable for the major part of the capital cost, which will be reflected in a rent free period. The works are to be funded from the capital programme and developer funding.

Improvements in the Condition and Suitability of Youth Centres

55. The improvement of Youth Centres would contribute to the priority theme of Stronger and Safer Communities.
56. Faringdon, Berinsfield and Witney were identified as unfit for purpose when the last FFP surveys were carried out. Faringdon has now relocated (to the Cromwell centre), with £200k developer funding identified to carry out improvement works. Berinsfield has had the urgent needs addressed (natural lighting and access to disabled WC's) and has additional funding allocated (£250k) for internal remodelling, although an additional £400k would be needed

to allow extensive remodelling. £220k is allocated to Witney for internal remodelling, however a full review including external areas would cost more (estimate £1m).

57. £1.22m has been allocated to Wallingford to provide a new youth centre and proposals are being progressed.
58. £300k developer funding is identified for improvements at Didcot and feasibility work is being carried out, however an additional £750k would be needed to allow extensive remodelling.
59. 'My Place' bids have been prepared for improvements to Abingdon and Banbury youth centres (estimate £2m and £3m respectively). Further remodelling is needed at Kidlington, Carterton, Wolvercote, Headington, Riverside and Blackbird Leys. Options for relocation need to be reviewed at Chipping Norton and Barton.
60. Refurbishment work is needed at Bicester, Eynsham, Thame, Chiltern Edge, Wheatley and East Oxford.
61. Further work is needed to determine priorities, the scope and feasibility of the works proposed and to provide a better indication of estimated costs.

Improvements in the Re-use and Recycling of Waste

62. Reducing the amount of landfill and ensuring levels of recycling is identified as part of the Council's strategic priority of making Oxfordshire a welcoming, safe and exceptional place to live, work, learn and visit. The priorities for 2009/10 are redevelopment of the Oakley Wood Recycling Centre where there are security concerns and the redevelopment of the Redbridge Recycling Centre where concerns are being expressed by the Environment Agency at the potential for environmental contamination. Options are currently being investigated
63. Improvements are also needed at Alkerton and Stanford in the Vale.
64. There is capital grant available of £3.475m (£3.036m in 2009/10 and £439k in 2010/11) which is earmarked to fund the above works, with any surplus available for the costs associated with the provision of new sites (new centre in north Oxford and satellite centres). It is currently unknown whether the cost of providing all of the new sites can be met from within this funding.
65. In 2009/10 it will be necessary to investigate the options and feasibility for both a new recycling centre in north Oxford and to develop satellite recycling centres.
66. Longer term, improvements will be needed at Dean Pit and Ardley Fields although no funding is currently identified for this.

Improvements in Schools

67. The Education priorities are set out in Appendix 2 and specific schemes are identified in the Education Forward Plan and Capital Programme.

Improving access to our buildings for people with disabilities

68. This contributes to the corporate objective of real choice.
69. The Council has 78 buildings which are defined as open to the public by BVPI 156. 55 of these buildings meet the required standards. Further improvements undertaken in 2007/08 and 89.7% of properties now meet the required standard, up from 70.5% in the previous year.
70. It is no longer necessary to submit a return for this performance indicator and alternative local measures are being considered.

Other Priorities

71. Appendix 2 contains many other property needs that are not identified as key property objectives. Many of the future needs have not been costed and it is not therefore possible to accurately quantify the Council's capital investment needs, but it could be in the order of £50 million over the next 5 to 10 years. Unless significant additional capital resources can be identified the Council will not be able to deal with these needs, which will have an impact on its ability to deliver its objectives.
72. There are significant needs beyond the period of this plan, but within the next ten years. These include:
- The West End Project, Oxford, in particular the desire to provide a new shared County Council and City Council Headquarters office, replacing the County Council's offices at County Hall and Speedwell House and possibly relocating Oxford City fire station;

Major Growth Areas

73. Major housing growth proposed in Oxfordshire will lead to a significant increase in the number of people who live and work in the County and who place demands on our local services and facilities. The County Council will seek to ensure the development of sustainable communities which are attractive places for people to live, work and spend their leisure time. Continued housing growth and associated commercial developments will require new or expanded infrastructure to be provided in a timely fashion to both support the new growth and to address past under-provision. The service directorates will need to be pro-active in identifying legitimate infrastructure schemes which could be funded, or part-funded, by developer contributions.
74. The regional spatial strategy (South East Plan) will set out the scale and the general strategy for distributing housing growth in Oxfordshire to 2026. The government has recently published proposed modifications to the draft SE Plan; the government proposes that at least 55,200 dwellings should be built in the county between 2006 and 2026 to support economic growth.

75. Under the proposed modifications, at least 40,680 of the proposed new dwellings would be in the Central Oxfordshire sub-region with the main locations as follows:

- Bicester (4,900 dwellings),
- Didcot (8,750 dwellings)
- Wantage-Grove (3,400 dwellings) and
- the built-up area of Oxford (8,000 dwellings) plus the government proposes a strategic urban extension to Oxford of 4,000 dwellings – the South Oxford Strategic Development Area - the boundary of which would be determined following a selective green belt review. The County Council is opposed to any breach of the green belt.

76. Outside of Central Oxfordshire, Banbury will continue to accommodate significant housing growth in view of its role as a market town in supporting its wider hinterlands.

77. Sites for some of the 55,200 dwellings proposed by government for 2006-26 have already been found. At 1 April 2007:

- about 3,200 dwellings were already completed
- about 8,400 had planning permission but were yet to be built .
- a further 14,880 dwellings were allocated in local plans but had yet to receive permission.

78. Since the above figures were compiled:

- planning permission has been granted for 3,300 dwellings at Great Western Park, Didcot and 1,585 dwellings at South West Bicester.
- The district councils have resolved to permit (subject to completion of S106 agreements) planning applications for housing for 1,070 dwellings at land south-east of Bankside, at Bodicote adjacent to Banbury and up to 700 dwellings at Ladygrove east, Didcot.
- proposals for a new settlement of 1, 075 dwellings at former RAF Upper Heyford are currently the subject of a public inquiry and
- an application is expected to be submitted for 2,500 dwellings at Grove airfield in 2009.

79. Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) are currently being prepared by the district councils; they will comprise a number of planning documents which collectively will deliver the spatial vision for each district within the overall vision set by the SE Plan. Core Strategy Development Plan Documents (DPDs) will determine the strategy for distributing the housing numbers across each of the districts, the direction of growth of the main settlements and may identify key strategic development sites in the main locations for growth of Oxford, Bicester, Didcot and Wantage-Grove and other towns eg Witney, Thame, Wallingford. Other smaller housing sites will be allocated through the districts' Site Allocations DPDs.

80. In setting out policies and proposals for housing growth, the new LDFs must take account of the issues facing service providers and their strategies and investment programmes for service delivery. Core Strategy DPDs will set out the

infrastructure requirements needed to support development of strategic sites, including the allocation of land for new or expanded services and facilities. It is important that the County Council as service provider provides early, good quality input to the LDF process on the type/scale of infrastructure required to deliver services to new communities, the costs of expanding existing or providing new facilities, funding sources, its phasing and who would be responsible for its delivery. The County Council should plan sufficiently far ahead for the improvement of existing or building of new facilities to enable the provision of good quality services to the residents of new housing developments without seeing deterioration in the quality of services for existing residents. (This would also inform the Council's Capital Strategy). In some cases there may be opportunities to do this in partnership with other service providers eg Primary Care Trust or Thames Valley Police. The directorates should also take account of the implications of proposed housing growth in determining priorities for the Capital Strategy and ensuing Programmes. To optimise the efficient use of resources, opportunities should be taken, where appropriate, to combine the solutions to existing capacity problems, funded from the appropriate sources, with the provision of new facilities required to support new growth which would be developer funded.

81. Outside the regional and local planning process, the government is developing an eco-town programme and has shortlisted Weston Otmoor as a potential location for an eco-town. If selected, it would provide 15,000 dwellings within the Cherwell part of Central Oxfordshire. Development on this scale would require significant provision of new infrastructure to support it, including highways and transport infrastructure, new schools, library and other community buildings and facilities. The County Council is opposed to the eco-town proposal.

Performance Indicator Targets and Benchmarking

82. From 2005/06 the Council has set targets for the main property performance indicators. Performance against the targets for 2007/08 and targets for 2008/09 are given in the Annual Report on the Property Portfolio which was considered by Cabinet in October.

Processes for Effective Asset Management

83. The purpose of Property Services is to manage the Council's property corporately. The roles of Property Services and the service directorates are set out in the Property Service Level Agreement. The Strategic Asset Management Team is responsible for ensuring that the Council makes effective use of its property and for preparation of the Corporate Asset Management Plan.
84. The Capital Steering Group is responsible for the overall strategic management and co-ordination of the Council's assets. It is responsible for ensuring that the Council's assets are fully and effectively used and support the Council's strategic priorities. The Group is chaired by the Portfolio Holder for Finance (with responsibility for Property) with membership including the Head of Property, Assistant Chief Executive (Transformation and Chief Finance Officer) and a representative at Head of Service level from each Directorate.

85. The Capital Working Group undertakes work on behalf of and makes recommendations to the Steering Group, and monitors progress on the capital programme and capital receipts.
86. An Asset Management Improvement Plan has been prepared to show the actions necessary to improve asset management within the Council and is included in Appendix 4. It responds to the recommendations of the Asset Management Peer Review undertaken in 2006, to the CPA Key Lines of Enquiry for the Use of Resources, the need to review arrangements to take account of current best practice and changes to the Council's property management arrangements. It is updated annually.

Involvement of Stakeholders

87. It is important that key stakeholders are involved in the asset management planning process. The key stakeholders are Members (including the Portfolio Holder with responsibilities for property and local Members), senior officers with a property remit and with responsibility for service delivery, property users and partners. The key mechanisms for involvement and consultation are given below:
- Corporate Asset Management Plan – Service Directorates and Members are involved in the preparation of the AMP. A draft AMP is considered by the Capital Steering and Working Groups, prior to consideration by the Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee, Cabinet & Council.
 - Fitness for Purpose Surveys – Fitness for Purpose Surveys for all non-school properties were carried out in 2006 and 2007. These were led by Property Services but conducted with service directorates. They will be requested in 2009 and then every 3 years.
 - Focus Groups – Officers and representatives of the Council's property consultant, Mouchel, meet regularly with a number of groups including a Schools Asset Management Plan Consultation Group, Library User Groups and Staff Consultative and Office building user groups to obtain feedback on building and property use and to consult on the development of asset management policy.
 - Project Specific Consultation - The Council consults with stakeholders on proposals for specific service changes and improvements.
 - Review Of Property Management Consultant Performance - Directorates are invited to comment on the quality of services provided by the Council's Property Management Consultants annually. Feedback on performance is used to inform improvements in the quality of services provided by both the consultant and Property Services. There are also regular meetings between Property Services, Mouchel and directorate representatives
 - Capital Programme – Post completion and post occupancy reviews take place for new properties.
 - Performance Indicator Targets and Benchmarking – The AMP includes targets for performance against property performance indicators and also

benchmarking information where this is available. The data is for 2005/06 and targets set for 2006/07. Full information on property performance indicators is given in the Annual Report on the Property Portfolio, which was approved by Cabinet in October .

- COPROP Strategic Property Management and Estate Management Surveys – The Council has taken part in these surveys and is taking action to address the issues arising.

Partnership Working

88. Local Strategic Partnerships, the Comprehensive Area Assessment and Local Area Agreements are all based on partnership working with the aim of delivering the best outcomes for an area. Opportunities will be sought to work with partners to share accommodation where that would improve joint working, efficiency and quality of services. Asset management planning processes and governance are being reviewed to ensure the right arrangements are in place for assets to be managed across service and partnership boundaries
89. Effective delivery of services and management of the Council's assets requires effective partnership working with other public sector organisations and the community.
90. The County Council has a jointly agreed protocol with Oxfordshire PCT which states the commitment to make the best joint use of property, work together to improve the flexibility and responsiveness of services, promote sustainable property and support partnership working with other organisations. Through the Better Offices Programme joint accommodation has been provided for PCT and Ridgeway Trust staff, enabling improvements in service delivery.
91. Partnership working is taking place with Thames Valley Police, looking at possibilities of joint property rationalisation and service provision.
92. Where appropriate the County Council will explore the transfer of assets to partners or community groups, when by doing so the assets could be used more effectively for the benefit of the local community. We are currently working with community groups on several schemes which will involve investment in County Council assets for the benefit of local communities, for example at Bampton and the transfer of land to enable community facilities to be provided, for example at Thame to provide football club facilities. We also help partner and community organisations with short term property needs, which helps to ensure continuity of service for example the Oxford Credit Union and the Drug and Alcohol Action team in Banbury.

Appendix 1 – Property Portfolio Summary at November 2007

Type of Property	Number of Establishments	Tenure			Asset Value
		Freehold	Leasehold	Other	
Academy	2	2	0	0	£20,431,930
Agricultural	21	20	0	1	£2,986,000
Archive	2	1	1	0	£8,026,728
Arts Centre	2	2	0	0	£2,540,310
Childrens Centre	16	12	1	3	£4,063,457
Childrens Home	2	2	0	0	£4,581,373
Community Education	36	30	3	3	£7,209,885
Countryside Recreation	8	7	0	1	£77,000
Day Centre	18	11	5	2	£6,343,068
Depot	9	7	1	1	£3,371,000
Elderly Persons Home	21	21	0	0	£8,264,350
Family Centre	2	1	0	1	£579,000
Field Study/Non Residential	1	0	1	0	£0
Field Study/Residential	4	3	0	1	£1,021,776
Fire Service House	37	37	0	0	£8,820,000
Fire Station	24	24	0	0	£27,814,000
Flat/Bedsit	13	9	0	4	£962,000
Garage/Store	6	5	1	0	£33,000
Garden/Amenity	1	1	0	0	£0
Gypsy Site	6	6	0	0	£1,178,000
Highway	1	1	0	0	
Highway Material Store	1	1	0	0	£80,000
Hostel	3	3	0	0	£3,200,000
House	68	64	1	3	£14,386,638
Impairment Service Unit	1	1	0	0	£227,000
Infant School	4	1	0	3	£2,830,665
Junior School	2	2	0	0	£7,262,842
Library	43	29	12	2	£24,433,938
Miscellaneous/None	3	3	0	0	£3,775,000

Type of Property	Number of Establishments	Tenure			Asset Value
		Freehold	Leasehold	Other	
Museum	10	7	1	2	£8,177,380
Nursery School	21	17	3	0	£11,546,355
Office	81	49	27	4	£35,931,442
Park & Ride	5	0	2	3	
Playingfield	2	2	0	0	£0
Primary School	226	106	5	115	£475,200,055
Pupil Referral Unit	1	1	0	0	£3,852,752
Register Office	8	3	5	0	£1,088,000
Resource Centre	6	6	0	0	£4,603,277
Schools Music Service	1	1	0	0	
Secondary School	32	24	1	7	£532,377,833
Special Needs Base	1	1	0	0	£213,000
Special School	14	13	0	1	£50,114,661
Sports Centre/Site	25	19	1	5	£34,498,295
Teaching Farm	1	1	0	0	£888,000
Town Recreation	1	1	0	0	£0
Training Centre	4	4	0	0	£11,660,197
Waste Disposal	11	7	1	3	£0
Water Sports	3	2	1	0	£258,010
Workshop	6	0	5	1	£0
Youth Club/Centre	29	25	1	1	£9,557,704
Totals:	846	596	79	167	£1,344,465,922

Appendix 2 - Corporate and Service Priorities with Significant Asset Implications

Corporate and service priorities with significant property implications are set out below, starting with Education priorities and then other corporate and service priorities. The table gives the priority, the strategy it arises from, the Council objective or priority it contributes to and a description of the asset implication.

Children, Young People & Families Capital Programme

Forward Plan 2008/09 – 2012/13

Priorities

1. The Plan has been developed to both support and contribute to achieving the following Corporate and Directorate priorities:
 - The Council's objectives of low taxes, real choice and value for money.
 - Key challenges in the County Council's Corporate Plan 2007/08 - 2011/12 are improving education and skills, promoting opportunity and independence and investing in infrastructure.
 - The priority area of thriving communities.
 - Key objectives of the Corporate Asset Management Plan (AMP) & Capital Strategy are modernisation and improvement of the condition of schools in accordance with the Schools AMP and the need to improve the condition and suitability of youth centres.
 - The outcomes set in the Children and Young People's Plan;
 - Be healthy
 - Stay safe
 - Enjoy and achieve
 - Make a positive contribution
 - Achieve economic wellbeing
 - Youth Matters: Next Steps agenda of providing safe places to go.
2. The Plan also reflects national priorities. The current emphasis is on choice, diversity and access – the secondary Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Programme, Primary Capital Programme, 16-19 Learning & Skills Council capital fund, Foundation Schools and Academies, Federation of schools and Trusts, healthy food and lifestyles, ICT, Children's Centres, extended schools, environmental sustainability, falling rolls and surplus spaces, popular and expanding schools.
3. CYP&F have started a programme of area reviews by locality of primary provision. This is linked to the Department for Children, Schools & Families (DCSF) Primary Capital Programme and is the biggest single change which has needed to be accommodated in the Forward Plan priorities.
4. The CYP&F priority areas approved as part of Corporate AMP & Capital Strategy for the distribution of available funding within the Forward Plan are:

- **Primary Capital Programme**
DCSF allocations start from 2009/10 and will be joined with the primary sector share of modernisation allocations, Devolved Formula Capital and any capital receipts to fund prioritised outcomes from the Primary Reviews currently underway. An approved Strategy for Change comprising the local perspective, baseline analysis, long term aims, approach to change and initial investment priorities has to be approved by the DCSF before allocations will be released.
- **Secondary Capital Programme (Building Schools for the Future)**
Secondary modernisation allocations and academy funding will be used to modernise secondary and all age special schools in the lead-in period to the BSF Programme. Planned works include the Oxford Academy and the relocation of non-school users, improvement of specialist areas, replacement of temporary buildings, addressing suitability problems, and 16-19 provision in special schools. This area also includes supporting the development of 14-19 provision using part of the Targeted Capital Funding of £8.0m over 2 years to improve diploma provision for 14-19 year olds and improving facilities for young people with Special Educational Needs.
- **Provision of School Places**
Meeting basic need through adaptation, extension and provision of new schools funded from pupil place allocations and developer contributions.
- **Children's & Family Centres**
Continuation of the Children's Centres programme with a further phase of provision using three more years of specific allocations and other joined up funding.
- **Halls and Kitchens**
This is a continuation of works to provide halls and dining areas for schools without this provision on the school site. Schools can use their Devolved Formula Capital funding to improve kitchens.
- **Special Educational Needs**
The continuation of the rolling programme of adaptations to help schools improve access and meet the needs of individual pupils using the Schools Access Initiative allocations.
- **Locally Controlled Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP)**
Programmes of improvement works agreed jointly by the three Dioceses and the Authority at Voluntary Aided Schools utilising DCSF LCVAP allocations.
- **Risk Management Programme**
Continuation of the rolling programme of security and health and safety improvements to technology ventilation, fire precautions, major security problems etc.

- **Opportunity Development**
Support for projects which, although not always high priority, have a large part or all of the funding met from external sources, including lottery, DCSF grant, developer contributions, land sales and District Council funding, following national and local initiatives.
 - **Outdoor Education Service**
An accommodation strategy is being developed to identify service needs and relative priorities for funding. This will build on the current development through the Big Lottery Fund at Woodlands and improvement through minor works.
 - **Improvement of Youth Centres**
Improvement of the condition and suitability of Youth Centres is a priority in the current Corporate AMP and Capital Strategy. A strategy has been developed based on fit for purpose assessments (suitability, sufficiency, condition and environmental performance) which identifies the Centres most in need of replacement or improvement. These have been prioritised. The timing and scale implementation will depend on resources being available from the Corporate Capital Programme and capital receipts.
 - **Children's Homes Development**
Completion of the work to relocate Thornbury House funded from the capital receipt from the sale of land at the current location.
5. These priority areas were endorsed by the AMP Consultation Group and are the CYP&F capital priorities within the Corporate AMP and Capital Strategy.
6. In addition to these areas there is Early Years Development, which includes resources which have been allocated in the past to the Children's Centres programme (Early Years Development Fund) and the Flexibility of Child Care allocation, which is 3 years of allocation to improve early years learning environments. There are also resources for annual programmes, which are a continuation of areas of expenditure from the previous Forward Plan, for Specific/Delegated Funding and a Risk/Contingency element.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Asset Implications 2009/10	Asset Implications 2010/11	Asset Implications 2011/12	Asset Implications 2012/13	Asset Implications 2013/14
Office reorganisations in the north, city and south of the County arising from the Review of Property Assets	Value for money.	£14.8 million of capital investment. £13 million of capital receipts to 2009/10.				
Improving the condition of the council's buildings	Value for money.	Continuation of a £25 million programme of additional investment over 5 years in repairs and maintenance, using prudential borrowing	Completion of a £25 million programme of additional investment over 5 years in repairs and maintenance, using prudential borrowing			
Occupational Health Service There is inadequate space at Rewley Road for the service. A temporary arrangement has been agreed with Community Safety whereby an additional area will be provided in the Fire Station. However, there is a need to relocate to more suitable premises. Co-location of the County Council, Fire Service and University Occupational Health Units is a long-term possibility.	Value for money.	Need for more suitable and larger accommodation. Capital or revenue implications, currently un-quantified and no funding identified	.			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Asset Implications 2009/10	Asset Implications 2010/11	Asset Implications 2011/12	Asset Implications 2012/13	Asset Implications 2013/14
Corporate Storage Needs There will continue to be a requirement for paper storage although this should reduce over time with a move to electronic storage.	Lower taxes, Value for Money	Approximately £100,000 per year investment required <u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u>	Approximately £100,000 per year investment required	Approximately £100,000 per year investment required		

CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & FAMILIES

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>YOUTH SUPPORT SERVICES The Youth Support Services accommodation strategy based on fit for purpose assessments of existing Young people's centres identifies 3 centres as unfit for purpose – Faringdon (addressed 07-09), Berinsfield, Witney – and 4 centres as unfit for purpose but with potential for economic improvement – Wallingford, Wheatley, Abingdon, Chipping Norton.</p> <p>Contributes to: the 5 key outcomes for young people within Every Child Matters – Change for Children and the CYP&F Children's & Young People's Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be Healthy • Stay Safe • Enjoy & Achieve • Make a positive contribution • Achieve Economic Well-being <p>and the Youth Matters: Next</p>	RC VFM	<p>Witney Centre - Adaptation to Witney Youth Centre to relocate Face 2 Face from Church Green and Connexions staff (BOP) and remodel internal layout and facilities. Funding allocated (£220k) and planned completion 09-10</p> <p>Further remodelling required to interior, work to exterior, hard court, landscaping (estimate £1m)</p> <p><u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 to allocate £250k in 09/10 and £500k in 2010/11.</u></p>	<p>Abingdon The Net - Good location but needs restyling to meet young peoples' needs and create co-located spaces to meet integrated agenda. Improvements needed to enhance accessibility of entrances, café/foyer, improved circulation, motorcycle maintenance workshop, dance studio, improved internal layout, new music practice/recording rooms, audiovisual area</p>	<p>Banbury Centre Reorganisation and enlargement of internal space either through adaptation and extension or rebuild if 'Myplace' bid is successful. Accommodation for Connexions and other schemes /projects, motor vehicle workshop, fitness suite, improvements to kitchen and social area, dance/music /performance, ICT and multimedia, covered play court. Cost being established but estimate £3m. If unsuccessful funding needed</p>	<p>Thame Centre Geographical location is good but location on the Lord Williams's Lower School site is inappropriate for the age range of Youth Support Services users. Overall assessed as poor. Improvements needed to suitability of internal space (e.g. music spaces), facilities and condition. Indicative £250k.</p> <p>SODC are producing a development brief for the existing cattle market site</p>	<p>Eynsham Remodelling and refurbishment needed (estimate £200k)</p> <p>Chiltern Edge Refurbishment (estimate £100k)</p> <p>Barton Non OCC owned. Potential for funding for new youth centre if housing development proceeds. Review of options needed.</p> <p>Blackbird Leys Non OCC owned. Redesign with City Council (estimate £100k)</p>

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>Steps agenda by providing safe “places to go” for young people. Also building upon the existing network of one stop shops and drop in facilities provided by Connexions, youth services and voluntary and community sectors.</p> <p>Corporate Plan: healthy & thriving communities and better public services.</p> <p>Corporate Asset Management Plan: improvement in the condition and suitability of young people’s centres.</p>		<p>Wallingford Centre – Replacement premises required to also house teams – Face 2 Face, Connexions & Behavioural Support – from 61A High Street (BOP). Funding allocated (£1.22m) to be funded from capital receipt from sale of part of the site and capital allocations. Completion planned 09-10.</p> <p>Berinsfield Centre – Project briefed. Internal and external improvements needed. Planned completion 09-10. Funded from capital programme (£250k), however</p>	<p>and ICT, and covered hard court area. Bid prepared for ‘Myplace’ funding. Cost being established (estimate £2m). If not successful funding needed from capital programme.</p> <p><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></p> <p>Chipping Norton - Current location provides poor accommodation for youth work. Need to identify alternative accommodation within the Town. Need is for large and small group spaces, coffee</p>	<p>from the capital programme.</p> <p>Wolvercote Centre – General investment to improve the property suitability and condition is required. £60,000. However major redesign needed to make it a centre of excellence (estimate c. £500k)</p>	<p>and relocation of the Centre to this site is being put forward as a service need which would require funding. However it will be 2-5 years before the market could leave and there is no certainty that relocation of the centre would form part of the redevelopment.</p> <p>Wheatley Centre – Although located on the edge of a school site, the location is good in relation to the village and no other alternative accommodation has been identified. Improvement needed to suitability, image and condition.</p>	

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>additional may be needed (£400k).</p> <p><u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 to slip beyond 2010/11</u></p> <p>New Cattle Market Centre, Banbury – A new youth/community centre is being provided as part of the Cattle Market development – funding from developer contribution and a percentage of the capital receipt from the disposal of the Bridge Street Bar.</p> <p>Didcot The Vibe – Improvements needed to layout and design. Feasibility study to consider extension to coffee bar/social</p>	<p>bar/café/kitchen, project space, ICT/arts/Information/workshop etc - quiet space, one-to-one space, office. Consideration of other services to be delivered from same space: YOT, Connexions, Counselling, Mentoring, Health, etc. Cost to be established dependent on location identified.</p> <p>Sweatbox, Wantage – Relocation of Centre as part of rationalisation of King Alfred's School onto 2 sites. Seeking funding from disposal of site</p>		<p>Indicative £100k</p> <p>Kidlington</p> <p>Remodelling (estimate £600k)</p> <p><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></p>	

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>area, improvement to hall internal and external refurbishment to include upgrade of basketball area. Funding est. £300,000 to be met from S106 contributions from Great Western Park Development. Full review needed for remodelling refurbishment (estimate additional £750k)</p> <p>Carterton Allendale Centre – Provision of a) art/media/ICT, recording and performing spaces b) improvement of kitchen and toilets. A start on part a) of this work is funded</p>	<p>and linked Section 106 Grove airport development. Cost and timescales not established.</p> <p>Bicester Refurbishment (estimate £200k) <i><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></i></p> <p>East Oxford Better use of space (estimate £60k) <i><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></i></p> <p>Headington</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>through Minor Works (£50k) although up to an additional £190k needed). Part b) not costed. Estimate total of £500k needed).</p> <p><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></p>	<p>Remodelling and refurbishment (estimate £400k)</p> <p><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></p> <p>Riverside Centre</p> <p>Create centre of excellence (estimate £3.03m)</p> <p><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></p>			
<p>CHILDREN'S HOMES</p> <p>Contributes to the 5 key outcomes for young people</p>	<p>RC</p> <p>VFM</p>	<p>Thornbury House – Unfit for purpose. Only passing Ofsted</p>	See 2009/10			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>within Every Child Matters and the CYP&F Children's & Young People's Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be Healthy • Stay Safe • Enjoy & Achieve • Make a positive contribution • Achieve Economic Well-being <p>Social & Health Care strategy document 'Placement Matters'</p> <p>Key objective of 90% of property fit for purpose by 2015</p> <p>Healthy & Thriving Communities and Better Public Services.</p> <p>Reducing inequality and breaking the cycle of deprivation.</p>		<p>assessments on the basis that Council is working on re-provision of new home on the existing site. Indicative programme is completion 2010/11 at an estimated cost of £1.5 million inc fees (2007). Sketch proposal being developed. Original proposal is funding from sale of surplus site but downturn in housing market may mean a need for other capital funding to be found. There is a risk that access cannot be achieved.</p> <p><u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 to allocate £750k in 2009/10 and £750k in 2010/11</u></p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Youth Offending Service		Colocation of Westgate and Crown House Offices - fit out costs. <u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 that this should be funded through BOP (estimated costs are £150k).</u>				

KEY CHANGES IN SERVICE AND THEIR ASSET IMPLICATIONS FROM 2014 ONWARDS

Changes in Service	Property Implications and possible timescale
<p>There are no proposals at present to increase the number of Youth Centres. The current geographical area distribution meets Service needs. There is a need for long term investment to improve the quality of accommodation as identified in the accommodation strategy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure there are operational youth centres in the current localities which meet the educational, training and social needs of young people. • Work towards relocating those centres which are on school sites. • Take advantage of opportunities to make improvements to properties which are generally fit for purpose. • Ensure that funding allocated in repair and maintenance programmes is targeted at centres identified as needing priority repairs. • Ensure the needs of the Service are considered in negotiations with developers 	<p>As opportunities arise relocate the Wantage, Wheatley, East Oxford and Thame Centres from school sites</p>

COMMUNITY SAFETY

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Risk Based Response Planning and Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) The statutory requirement for Fire Authorities to allocate resources to reduce and control risks and establish local response standards has initiated a fundamental review of fire and rescue 'cover'. The outcome of this review reported to Cabinet in January 2007 confirmed that current fire station locations largely achieve the required response to incidents across the County. However, there are several areas in which local circumstances and opportunities exist that are identified below,	RC, VFM	Asset Implications for the areas identified largely require replacement properties with the subsequent release of existing property holdings. New properties are likely to be co-located with other emergency services or other partners. Specific expectations are identified below	See 2009-2010	See 2009-2010	See 2009-2010	See 2009-2010

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Regional Control Room Project. This national project is designed to consolidate individual Authorities Control Rooms on a regional basis. Whilst this will release certain accommodation the retention of "out of scope activities" will require the removal of existing equipment and the reformatting of the property to allow for an extend hours operations centre. The possibility of a sub regional approach to this work is also underway but cannot as yet provide certainty in this area	VFM	Nil	Current expectation is that there will be limited property effects but this area will be monitored carefully as the project proceeds. Current cut over is programmed for 20011 The removal of legacy equipment and changes to existing property are anticipated. Current belief is that this can be contained at £50k as a contingency provision. <u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 to defer this as</u>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
			<u>consolidation is not expected until 2011/12</u>			
Banbury Fire Station	RC, VFM	Banbury Fire Station - Relocation to site nearer the M40 Junction. This is an opportunistic approach with a developer led provision of a suitable alternative site with the consequential disposal of the existing site. Training and wider community use facilities would be required	See 2009-2010	See 2009-2010	See 2009-2010	See 2009-2010
Wantage Fire Station - This Fire Station is in a town that is identified for growth in the South East Plan / Structure Plan and the Local Plan / Local Development Framework. Further accommodation provision may be	As above					Unknown – dependent on valuation of current site and scale of developer contributions

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
necessary to serve planned growth in population in Grove. The existing site is constrained in its location and space available. In line with all intended provision of new Fire and Rescue property, options that can encourage alternative community uses are encouraged. Developer contributions are being sought. These plus the income from the capital disposal are currently envisaged as sufficient. However, this needs to be assessed during 2008/9. Actual movement to a new station is currently not anticipated till at least 2013/14						received
Wallingford and Thame Fire Stations	RC, VFM		Thame The Fire Service is establishing its requirements, following which an appraisal of options will be needed (Funding allocated in the capital			Wallingford. Due to Consultation on the SODC Local Development Framework it is unlikely that a new site will be available until 2011, meaning a new fire station would not be

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
			programme).			completed until April 2013. (Funding allocated in capital programme).
Trading Standards – relocation from County Hall	VFM		Potential opportunity / consequence from the BOP. Current expectation is that Trading Standards could relocate to an alternative site			
Gypsy and Traveller Service Relocation to alternative office space as a result of the progressive upgrade of Bicester Fire Station	As above				Anticipate that this is the point at which alternative arrangements will be necessary. Space depends on Service size (e.g. if still providing a contracted service to Buckinghamshire. Minimum size = 4 FTE, Max 8 FTE.	

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objective or Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
					If providing Services for Bucks need to be strategically located – Bicester = good location. Potential to develop accommodation on site may be an option.	
Shared Services Potential for further extension of space for FWT etc	LT	Any further development of services on this site will have property implications. As yet these are not known with any certainty.				
Redbridge Travellers Site			Additional requirement to the £850k in the capital programme. CSG agreed on 28/11/08 to allocate £330k in 2010/11			

KEY CHANGES IN SERVICE AND THEIR ASSET IMPLICATIONS FROM 2014 ONWARDS	
Changes in Service	Property Implications and possible timescale
For Fire and Rescue, Emergency Planning and possibly Safer Communities Unit Relocation of Rewley Road Fire Station to facilitate West End Strategy using the Northern Gateway proposals.	<p>Long-term aspiration to reconfigure fire cover in the Oxford</p> <p>Could release some existing property. But expectation is that a City Centre base for an appliance would still be a requirement. Main facility envisaged at Pear Tree. Co-location with other emergency services desirable and sufficient accommodation for Emergency Planning and Safer Communities Unit to relocate to the site. Further accommodation also desirable for other Community Safety Directorate services so as to allow sharing of administrative and other supporting services. Expected timescale – 2014 to 2016?</p>
Additional service provision as a result of Weston Otmoor	<p>Current expectation is that, if Weston Otmoor proceeds, Bicester / Pear Tree will be required to be further upgraded in excess of that initially identified. It is probable that additional facilities will be necessary. These are yet to be scoped fully due to the level of uncertainty surrounding the Weston Otmoor proposals.</p>

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY - Integrated Transport Unit

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Environment and Economy – Integrated Transport Unit Implementation of Best Value Review of Funded Transport.	Efficient and effective service delivery.	Abbey Centre, (Abingdon Depot) Insufficient parking provision to support service development identified within BV review.				
	Efficient and effective service delivery. Reduction in Co2 emissions	Redlands Centre (Banbury Depot) Insufficient parking provision to support existing requirement for 8 vehicles- currently restricted to 3 vehicles with other currently offsite. Depot Supervisor needs own area for supervision and confidential				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>work. Existing transport demand identifies Banbury Depot as a key service provider. There is a need to provide increased capacity before additional work can be taken on board.</p> <p>Provision of bulk diesel fuel store will support control of fuel costs and management of Carbon emissions. Note – <i>Negotiations underway with CDC for use of space in CDC Depot Banbury</i></p>				
	Efficient and effective service delivery.	<p>Barton End, fleet ops HQ & Oxford (Area Depot) Insufficient parking provision to support existing</p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		requirement for 14 vehicles – currently limited to 11 vehicles, 3 are parked at Oxford Options. Increase demand on service confirmed.				
	Efficient and effective service delivery.	Oxford Options (Main Admin Office) The accommodation was designed to support day centre clients for S&CS, current proposal is some extension to building & shared use with the Day Service for Older People (currently at Shotover View site). Internal accommodation is significantly compromised. Staffing numbers will increase in order to meet increased demand from				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>amin service users& complete recommendations of BV review.</p> <p>External parking is used as overflow for Barton End, for Vehicle Management Team & for staff. It is now recognised joint use of site will not allow either service to function effectively.</p>				

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY – Highway Depots

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>Oxfordshire Highways Highway Depot Strategy</p> <p>Part of the service improvement to provide an efficient, reliable and customer focussed highway service through the development of Oxfordshire Highways is to minimise the environmental impact of its services.</p> <p>The priority in the Depot Strategy is to deal with urgent issues of compliance with environmental and health and safety legislation and to develop a more sustainable approach.</p>	<p>Preserving our rural environment is part of the Council's priority of 'helping our economy to grow as fast as possible.... In a way that does not prejudice our future environment</p>	<p>Kidlington Office.</p> <p>Extend car park if Co-op agree to land sale ((£20k).</p> <p><u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 that this is not a priority</u></p> <p>Chipping Norton.</p> <p>Mess and Washroom for standby and emergency crews. (£15k).</p> <p><u>CSG agreed on 28/11/08 that this is not a priority</u></p>	<p>Mouchel will be instructed to carry out a detailed study of depot requirements with a view to funding essential works through the term contract renewal due in April 2010 and obtaining planning approvals in advance. As a minimum the following works are required and will be specified for construction in the first year of the new contract to achieve maximum benefit. The contract term</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
			<p>will be 10 years.</p> <p>Deddington Depot</p> <p>Upgrade site lighting (£10k)</p> <p>Cover existing salt store (£350k)</p> <p>Construct new offices (£260k) to rationalise current temporary buildings and permit safe development of site.</p> <p>Drayton Depot</p> <p>Provide covered salt store (£550k)</p> <p>Extend recycling facility by acquiring land to remove site constraints</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
			(£50k) Chipping Norton Cover existing salt store (£350k)			

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY – Countryside Service

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Protection, maintenance and improvement of countywide public rights of way network (statutory duty).	VFM	<p>Consolidation of Countryside Services accommodation. £1m allocated in the capital programme for 2009/10 and 2010/11.</p> <p>Repairs to bank of the River Thames throughout Oxford. The towpath is recorded as a public footpath; carries the Thames Path National Trail and is a vital commuting route for walkers and cyclists as well as being an attraction for visitors and local recreational use.</p>	See 2009/10			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>Capital sums have been allocated in 06/07 and 07/08 for essential repairs where we clearly need to do something, either for Health & Safety reasons or for reputational reasons. A rolling programme of repairs is in place, which has allowed economies of scale to be achieved. A final year of funding is required to complete the required essential works.</p> <p>Estimate: £300k</p> <p><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no</u></p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<u>funding allocated</u>				
Protection, maintenance and improvement of countywide public rights of way network (statutory duty).		Public Right of Way Bridges: A significant proportion are large engineering structures of brick, stone or steel over 8m requiring proper asset management. There is currently no recognition in the capital programme of the need to have a rolling programme of replacement as they meet the end of their life (in contrast to other top quartile authorities). Estimate: £50k for urgent works and full	Level of funding required for ongoing programme to be based on results of inspections in 09/10	Level of funding required for ongoing programme to be based on results of inspections in 09/10	Level of funding required for ongoing programme to be based on results of inspections in 09/10	Level of funding required for ongoing programme to be based on results of inspections in 09/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		inspection of all >8m structures to form the basis of a prioritized and costed programme for future years.				

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY – Waste Management

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Deliver the County Council's target for recycling household waste	LT, RC, VFM	<p>Redevelop the Redbridge Recycling Centre. Brought forward due to EA concerns about deteriorating infrastructure. (Estimate £1m; however initial feasibility work being undertaken).</p> <p>Redevelop the Oakley Recycling Centre. (Estimate £750k however detailed design needed).</p> <p>Develop strategy for satellite recycling</p>	Redevelopment or renew the Alkerton Recycling Centre. (Estimate £750k, however costing feasibility needed).	Deliver strategy for additional sites (estimate £1.5m for satellite recycling centres and £2.5m for new site north of Oxford (although early estimates based upon no feasibility).	Redevelop Stanford in the Vale Recycling Centre. Estimate of £350k but costing feasibility needed.	<p>Redevelop or renew the Dean Pit Recycling Centre. (Estimate £350k, however costing feasibility needed).</p> <p>Potentially Start the renewal of the Ardley Fields Recycling centre. (Estimate unknown).</p>

		centres. (Estimate £25k for feasibility work to be funded from revenue).				
		Develop a new recycling centre to the north of Oxford. (Estimate £25k for investigation of potential sites and feasibility work – to be funded from revenue).				

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY - Property Services

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Climate Change adaptation measures	LT, VFM	£1m <i><u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u></i>	£1m	£1m	£1m	£1m

SOCIAL & COMMUNITY SERVICES

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
Residential Accommodation for Adults with a Physical Disability To provide a range of accommodation for people living with a physical disability either as individuals, couples or families. It is envisaged that such provision will be through partner organisations but that the County could assist by providing sites for the building of this accommodation.	RC VfM LT	A range of accessible accommodation is required over the next few years. Details of the specific properties needed per annum are as follows. 20 x 2 bedroom accessible accommodation. 5 family homes where one or both parents are disabled. 3 x 2/3 bedroomed accommodation for couples.	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		A 6 bed supported housing scheme With 24hr care for young people, particularly school leavers and others returning from out of County placements.				
Residential Accommodation for Adults for Adults with Learning Disabilities Continue to increase the independence of people with learning disabilities by providing them with the opportunity of living as tenants within their own homes as opposed to residential accommodation or with parents.	RC VfM LT	'There will be 119 people needing accommodation from now until 2011. Many of these will have physical disabilities as well as a learning disability and many will also have other specialist needs. Consequently a significant number cannot be accommodated in ordinary housing.	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		Therefore there is a continuing need for purpose built adapted premises for clients using part of sites owned but being sold by the County Council.'				
Day Service Provision for Adults with Learning Disabilities Develop day services for people with a learning disability. To comprise of a countywide distribution of core and resource bases.	RC VfM LT	Re-provision of the core base from Moorland Centre, Witney to Moorview. Re-provision of the core base in Abingdon.	Re-provision of the core base in Wantage Re-provision of the satellite base in Bicester. Re –provision of the core base in Cowley.			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
			Re-provision of the satellite base in Headington.			
Homes for Older People Work with external providers to ensure there is sufficient and appropriate accommodation for Older People in homes throughout the County.	RC VfM LT	Continue to work with OSJ to re-provision the homes in Banbury, Bicester, Chipping Norton and Thame. Review the other 8 homes within which OSJ provide a service in the context of changing demand for Older Peoples accommodation. These homes are as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake House, Adderbury • Marston Court, Oxford • Townsend House, 	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>Oxford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longlands, Oxford • Stirlings, Wantage • Chilterns End, Henley • Glebe House, Kidlington • Mayott House, Abingdon <p>Develop a strategy for the provision of Extra Care Housing throughout the County with external providers.</p>				
Day Centres for Older People As part of the Prevention and Intervention Day Services Strategy the existing day centres have been reviewed and they roles put into the context of the	RC VfM LT	A programme over the next 5 years to create 11 resource centres across the	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
main agenda of supporting people to live in their own homes. As a consequence the type of day centres currently provided need to change.		<p>County through the upgrading and replacing of existing day centres and in some cases the complete new provision of a centre. These will be in Banbury, Wantage, Kidlington, Thame, Didcot, Henley and two in Oxford.</p> <p>Funding has already been identified for one Oxford site, Banbury, Abingdon and Wantage, although additional funding needed for Banbury.</p> <p>It is hoped that land and/or some funding will be achieved through the section 106 process, but additional funding may be needed.</p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		There will also be a need to improve the buildings from which the secondary type of day services will be provided in the smaller towns and villages.				
Adult Learning The Adult Learning service has historically been provided on school sites across the county with no formal agreements. The pressure on space within schools is now affecting the Adult Learning space occupied. The Adult Learning Service also underwent a restructure in 2004 which identified the need to rationalise and review the accommodation from both a service and cost perspective. Due to the occupation of school premises, there is no funding to be generated from relinquishing this accommodation. The Developer Funding team is assisting in areas of new growth to secure additional funding.		Property Services looking at options available, subject to funding. Bicester – capital estimated at £500,000 or revenue implication of £70,000pa (rent, rates and service charge) Didcot – capital estimated at £500,000 or revenue implication of £70,000pa (rent, rates and service charge)				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>The current need is for 12 main centres across the county where there is either no or limited presence. The priorities are as follows:</p> <p>Priority 1</p> <p>Bicester (currently in Bicester Community College – not suitable due to reduction in space and lack of separation from school pupils.)</p> <p>Didcot (limited presence in the Library building – service currently managed from Berinsfield, which acts as the Main Centre)</p>	RC VFM	<u>Considered by CSG on 28/11/08 but no funding allocated</u>				
<p>Priority 2</p> <p>Witney</p> <p>Henley</p> <p>Abingdon</p> <p>Banbury (see priority 5.)</p>	RC VFM		<p>Likely to be similar costs as Bicester and Didcot</p> <p>Witney - capital estimated at £500,000 or revenue implication of £70,000pa (rent, rates and service charge)</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
			<p>Henley capital estimated at £500,000 or revenue implication of £70,000pa (rent, rates and service charge)</p> <p>Abingdon - capital estimated at £500,000 or revenue implication of £70,000pa (rent, rates and service charge)</p>			
<p>Priority 3</p> <p>Due to successive service restructures, approximately 60 staff are based in unsatisfactory accommodation in and around Oxford City. The service wishes to consolidate these staff, either into one central hub in Oxford or into regional bases, depending on the solutions identified for the regional Adult Learning Centres</p>	<p>LT</p> <p>VFM</p>			Cost to be assessed		

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>Priority 4</p> <p>In order to protect the presence of Adult Learning Centres in existing school premises, formal occupation agreements are being sought between Adult Learning and the schools. When a 'hire of premises' agreement has been approved by Legal Services, negotiations will be undertaken with each 'host school' and other schools where an Adult Learning evening programme is delivered.</p>	<p>RC</p> <p>VFM</p>	<p>Property Services and Legal Services assisting in preparing appropriate documentation.</p>				
<p>Priority 5</p> <p>The current Adult Learning centre in Banbury is located in a neighbourhood (Grimsbury) rather than the town centre. In view of Banbury's size the AL Service is seeking additional appropriate central accommodation for servicing all residents of Oxfordshire's second largest town.</p>	<p>RC</p> <p>VFM</p>	<p>The AL Service has set up a working group to increase overall provision in Banbury. This initiative would be enhanced by having a town centre presence.</p>		<p>Costs to be assessed</p>		
<p>To plan for the relinquishing of the under-used centre in Berinsfield, in order that funding can be</p>	<p>RC</p>	<p>Utilising possible capital receipt from relinquishment of</p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
released to help pursue Priority 2.	VFM	the centre in Berinsfield, in order to secure appropriate accommodation in Didcot.				
Registration Service To improve customer service	Value for money Real Choice	Re-provision of or improvement to the Witney, Bicester and Oxford registration offices. Witney Registration office – current accommodation scored as generally 'fit for purpose' but does not have a customer waiting area and one registrar's room does not meet DDA requirements. In addition there is restricted use of marriage room. Lack of waiting room has generated adverse client feedback.	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>Witney office's problems were discussed at the S&CS Strategy & Performance Review where councillors expressed their concern and recommended that action be taken.</p> <p>Bicester Register Office – current accommodation scored as 'generally fit for purpose'. General office accommodation poor and has restricted waiting area. Very restricted use of marriage room during peak wedding season, most certainly resulting in loss of business/income.</p> <p>Oxford Register office – uncertainty as to future of site.</p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		Present accommodation has some restrictions for growing service. Past Scrutiny Review indicated urgent improvements needed for waiting areas and storage facilities.				
Heritage To provide additional storage for archives and historic collections for Oxfordshire Record Office and Oxfordshire Studies to BS5454 standards. a. feasibility of increasing storage at ORO by installing mezzanines over the reading room	LT, RC, VFM	Feasibility completed and costs identified – external funding to be sought but likely to require an OCC contribution Some funding available for roller racking but further	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10	See 2009/10

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>b. installing roller racking and making environmental and security improvements at Holton to take historic collections</p> <p>c. pursue the idea of an integrated 'Oxfordshire History Centre' with Oxford University, Oxford Brookes University and other potential partners</p>		investigation of needs to meet BS5454 standards required.				
<p>Cogges Manor Farm Museum: Capital investment required to allow selected farm buildings to be used for new purposes to help ensure the long-term sustainability of the site.</p>	LT,RC,VFM	<p>Estimate of full cost £1.5 million</p> <p>Possibility of grant aid/HLF funding</p>				

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
The Oxfordshire Museum: Demolition and removal of the Pratten building to make way for the construction of the new Soldiers of Oxfordshire Museum	LT, RC, VFM					
Libraries The improvement of library buildings is a high priority for customers and the service. In the Public Library User Survey 2007, Oxfordshire had the lowest satisfaction rating amongst English counties for the interior of library buildings and the second lowest for the exterior presentation of buildings. This is set against the fact that in national and local surveys, library stakeholders consistently cite the importance of library environments as a key determinant of use, (along with good book stock and convenient opening hours.) The Fitness for Purpose survey 2007, indicated that the library service has a very high proportion	RC VFM	Central Library Central is one of the 15 libraries identified as unfit for purpose with economic potential. Agreement has been reached in principle with the Westgate Partnership to refurbish the Central Library at a cost of £5.5m (2008) as part of the overall Westgate re-development. However, the Partnership has delayed the start of the project as a result of the unstable economic	Central Library (see 2009-10) Banbury Library Banbury Library is one of the 3 libraries identified as unfit for purpose. £4.060m capital spread over 2010-11 - 2012-13 has been agreed for the development of a new library on the site adjacent to The Mill (although sale of land is not agreed). Capital allocation was based on cost calculations completed in March 2007 for	Banbury Library (see 2010-11) Grove Library To take account of planned growth, initial work has been undertaken to re-locate the library to the planned centre of the Airfield development. Developer contributions will be secured but it is unlikely that these will fund the totals cost of a new library and the funding gap may be in	Banbury Library (see 2010-11) Refurbishment of county town libraries; Henley and Wantage (See 2010-11) Grove Library (see 2011-12)	

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>of buildings which are unfit for purpose when compared to buildings county-wide and a much lower proportion of buildings which are fit for purpose:</p> <p>10 Libraries (23%) – Fit for purpose (county-wide 43%)</p> <p>15 Libraries (35%) – Generally fit for purpose (county-wide 37%)</p> <p>15 Libraries (35%) – Unfit for purpose with potential for economic improvement (county-wide 13%)</p> <p>3 Libraries (7%) – Unfit for purpose (county-wide 2%)</p> <p>Evidence both elsewhere and locally (eg. Kidlington) demonstrates on a consistent basis that the improvement and/or replacement of old, unfit for purpose buildings has a positive impact on all aspects of libraries use and that such improvements will support corporate priorities and all priorities in the Library Service Business</p> <p>Priorities for building and service improvements are primarily driven</p>		<p>climate and work is now unlikely to commence until 2009-10. Completion of the project will take 12-18 months. There may be property implications for the provision of a temporary library service if this cannot be accommodated in Macclesfield House as originally planned. Although it has been agreed in principle that the developer will meet the cost of temporary provision, this is based on the costs associated with Macclesfield House. If the project does not go ahead, the refurbishment of the Central Library will become the highest unfunded</p>	<p>the unsuccessful Lottery bid. It is highly likely that there will be a significant funding gap once a detailed scheme has been identified. Work on this will commence in 2008-9 but is unlikely to be complete until 2009-10.</p> <p>Refurbishment of county town libraries; Abingdon</p> <p>The county town libraries together with the Central Library, account for over 60% of the library service's business (ie. issues, visits). Abingdon Library is the second busiest service point after Central. The current building</p>	<p>excess of £500,000.</p> <p>Refurbishment of county town libraries; Henley and Wantage</p> <p>The county town libraries, together with the Central Library, Banbury, Bicester, Cowley and Didcot, account for over 60% of the library service's business (ie. issues, visits). Refurbishment of those not included in new build schemes will be required to accommodate modern service concepts such as self service.</p>		

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
<p>by fitness for purpose assessments, levels of business and potential business (and therefore a focus on county town libraries) by customer feedback and by significant planning developments, usually housing and/or retail developments and opportunities to replace or enhance libraries through developer funding are maximised alongside capital investment.</p> <p>Capital has been allocated for the highest service priorities but there remains the possibility of significant funding gaps (see opposite) and neither a scheme nor capital funding has been allocated to one of the 3 unfit for purpose libraries (Chipping Norton) See opposite.</p> <p>Capital (600K) for general library refurbishment has been allocated over 3 years (2008-9 – 2010-11) and this will be used to improve unfit for purpose libraries not noted here such as Summertown and Wallingford.</p>		<p>capital priority for the service.</p> <p>Watlington Library; Watlington is one of the 15 libraries identified as unfit for purpose with economic potential. Planning permission to extend the library has been granted and work is likely to commence in 2009. The bulk of the project will be funded by capital receipts from sale of first floor accommodation but some additional capital has also been allocated. Falling property prices may mean that the capital receipt will be inadequate and further capital funding may be required.</p> <p>Bicester Library</p>	<p>provides only 46% of the desired floorspace and although an alternative location is unlikely, refurbishing the existing premises to a high standard to accommodate modern concepts such as self service will be necessary.</p> <p>Charlbury Library Charlbury Library is one of the 15 libraries identified as unfit for purpose with economic potential. A scheme at Spendlove Centre is under consideration, involving Adult Learning. The cost to OCC is</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>Bicester is one of the 15 libraries identified as unfit for purpose with economic potential. Plans to relocate the library to new first floor premises as part of a civic space in the re-developed shopping centre have been agreed in principle, at an estimated cost of £2.2m (in 2007). £820k allocated in capital programme with remainder funded from developer funding and capital receipts. However the project has been delayed as a result of a change to the original developer and is unlikely to commence until 2009-10. It is likely that there will therefore be a</p>	<p>estimated to be £430k and funding of £300k is ring-fenced from sale of Old Primary School, the remainder will be sourced from other capital funding. However the Thomas Gifford Charity which is a partner in the scheme may find it difficult in the current economic climate to secure sufficient funds from their planned enabling development which may delay the scheme.</p> <p>Cowley Library</p> <p>Cowley Library is one of the 15 libraries identified as unfit for purpose with economic potential. Some</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>funding gap.</p> <p>Headington Library Headington is one of the 3 libraries identified as unfit for purpose. Capital has been allocated to improve access and ensure the building is DDA compliant. Work likely to start in 2008-9 but programme is not yet agreed.</p> <p>Chipping Norton Library Chipping Norton is one of the 3 libraries identified as unfit for purpose. A developer proposal to build a new library looks unlikely to succeed and appears not to be supported by either planners or residents (although residents are supportive of a new library in principle)</p>	<p>developer funding has been secured to increase the public floorspace and the most likely means to achieve this may be to install a mezzanine floor, (the library was designed to take such a floor but it was never built). However, additional funding will be necessary to achieve this.</p> <p>Didcot Library Didcot is an important county town library in an area of significant housing and population growth. Developer funding (£800K) has been secured to improve Didcot Library and the Town Centre plan includes an aspiration for a</p>			

Service Priority	Relevant Council Objectives & Priorities	Property Implications 2009-2010	Property Implications 2010-11	Property Implications 2011-2012	Property Implications 2012-13	Property Implications 2013-14
		<p>If the developer scheme cannot progress, alternative options should be considered. Excepting the Central Library (see above, this is now the highest unfunded priority in the service.</p> <p>Botley Consistent problems with foul flooding at Botley and the small size of the existing leased premises have resulted in an options appraisal to consider alternative premises. If the library were to be re-located Capital costs would be incurred for possible conversion costs and for fit-out.</p>	<p>new library in the expanding shopping centre, providing a better location for the library. On current market values the sale of the existing building would yield c £1m. However, based on estimates for Bicester Library and the cost of the new High Wycombe Library (over £2m), both on first floor locations in new shopping centres there is still likely to be a shortfall in funding if such a scheme. There is as yet no firm timescale for potential scheme.</p>			

Appendix 3 – Properties identified as ‘Unfit for Purpose’

Ref.	Establishment Name	Tenure	Action
10078	Banbury Library	Leased in by OCC	Funding allocated in Capital Programme
13983	Chipping Norton Library	Owned by OCC	Consideration being given to replacement library being provided as part of a housing development.
11197	Headington Library	Leased in by OCC	Negotiations have continued with the City Council to establish a solution which meets accessibility and listed building criteria and is affordable and suitable for the service. A draft planning application for works needed to the listed building is due to be submitted to English Heritage and the City Council imminently. Completion is due October 2009.
10062	25/27 West Bar, Banbury	Owned by OCC	Option appraisal for replacement being undertaken.
14349	Witney Day Centre (The Elms)	Owned by OCC	Scheme being progressed to relocate to Moorview, Witney. Due to complete February 2009.
13376	Ridgeway Volunteer Hostel (Store), Wantage	Leased in by OCC	Project underway to consolidate Countryside Service accommodation. Funding allocated in capital programme.
11607	Oakley Wood Traveller Site	Owned by OCC	Site purchased to secure long-term future. Planning application for improvements approved.
13999	Castle View Elderly Persons Home	Owned by OCC	Replacement is proposed as part of the new care home and PCT facility on the Rockhill Farm site, which is due to start on site in October 2008 with completion in early 2010.
10145	Greenwood Centre Offices	Owned by OCC	To be replaced as part of the Better Offices Programme by December 2009.
12612	Wallingford Youth Centre	Owned by OCC	Replacement planned. Funding from capital receipt and capital programme allocation. Due to complete December 2009.

Appendix 4 – Asset Management Improvement Plan September 2007 – Review of Progress

Improvement Required	Action Required	Timescale	Responsibility	Progress
Charter Mark	Respond to findings of Charter Mark self assessment. Actions to be agreed.	December 2007	Mark Tailby	Underway and ongoing.
COPROP Strategic Management Survey	Respond to findings of Survey. Actions to be agreed.	November 2007	Mark Tailby	Follow up interviews with respondents held. Actions taken and work with COPROP taken place to improve questionnaire.
Major Growth Areas	Improve the link between strategic asset management planning and planning for growth areas. Actions to be agreed.	November 2007	Mark Tailby/ Linda Currie	Mark Tailby now a member of the Strategic Sites Board.
The Capital Strategy – this should be the driver for resource management.	Develop the Strategy so that it is clearer how capital needs will be met.	November 2007	Capital Steering Group	Capital Strategy revised by Capital Programme Manager and approved by Capital Steering Group.

Asset Management Improvement Plan – December 2008

Improvement Required	Action Required	Timescale	Responsibility
Improved management of assets across service and partnership boundaries	Review role and membership of Capital Steering and Working Groups to achieve a more strategic, cross service and partnership approach to asset management	Revised arrangements in place by June 2009	Assistant Head of Property working with Capital Programme Manager and Capital Working and Steering Groups
Partnership working on asset management	Develop mechanisms for sharing asset management information and plans with City and district council's, PCT and TVP and community organisations with the aim of improving partnership working, use of assets and service delivery	In place by September 2009	Assistant Head of Property
Ensuring assets are fit for purpose	Continue to develop an action plan for all assets that are not fit for purpose	Complete by June 2009	Assistant Head of Property
Making effective use of Property Reviews	Develop a programme of property reviews for approval by the Capital Steering Group	In place by April 2009	Assistant Head of Property