

Options Appraisal Matrix

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
23. Brief description	Refurbishment of the Churchyard including installation of lighting and a power source, introduction of paving features such as new radial paving around the church entrance and a paving maze, lifting and relaying sections of existing paving, additional benches and new planting.	As Option 1 but replacing all existing paving with new York stone rather than lifting and relaying sections of existing paving.
24. Scope and Exclusions (where different to section 3)	As in Section 3	As in Section 3
25. Benefits and strategy for achievement (where different to section 10)	Improved access and amenity value of the Churchyard as a publicly accessible garden for the benefit of City workers, visitors and residents. Improvement works to be implemented using external funding and carried out to a quality which will ensure maintenance of the pathways will not be recharged to the City in the foreseeable future.	Improved access and amenity value of the Churchyard as a publicly accessible garden for the benefit of City workers, visitors and residents. Improvement works to be implemented using a mixture of external <u>and City funding</u> and carried out to a quality which will ensure maintenance of the pathways will not be recharged to the City in the foreseeable future.
26. Programme (where different to section 11)	As Section 13	As Section 13
27. Constraints and assumptions (where different to section 12)	As Section 14	As Section 14
28. Risk implications (where different to section 13)	As Section 15	As Section 15
29. Stakeholders and consultees (where different to section 14)	As Section 16	As Section 16
30. Legal implications (where different to section 15)	As section 17	As Section 17
31. HR implications (where different to section 16)	N/A	N/A

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
32. Benchmarks or comparative data (where different to section 17)	N/A	N/A

Financial Implications	Option 1	Option 2
33. Total Estimated Cost (£)	66,000	81,600
34. Anticipated source(s) of project funding (where different to section 18)	As Section 20	As Section 20 plus £15,500 from City Fund
35. Anticipated phasing of capital expenditure	Q2-Q3 2014/15	Q2-Q3 2014/15
36. Estimated capital value/return (£)	N/A	N/A
37. Fund/budget to be credited with capital return	N/A	N/A
38. Estimated ongoing revenue implications (£)	Revenue neutral. The running costs of the proposed lights and their routine maintenance will be the responsibility of the Church.	Revenue neutral The running costs of the proposed lights and their routine maintenance will be the responsibility of the Church.
39. Source of ongoing revenue funding	Existing local risk budgets	Existing local risk budgets
40. Fund/budget to be credited with income/savings	N/A	N/A
41. Anticipated life	20 years plus	20 years plus
42. Investment Appraisal	The opportunity for externally funded works pre-empts the Church recharging the City for reasonable maintenance costs.	The benefit of externally funded works pre-empting the Church recharging the City for reasonable maintenance costs, is offset in part by the City having to contribute for the works.

43. Affordability (where different to section 19)	As in Section 21	As Option 2 is not achievable within the existing external funding and would rely on additional funding from City Fund hence it is not considered affordable.
44. Proposed procurement approach (where different to section 20)	As in Section 22	As in Section 22

45. <u>Recommendation</u>	<i>It is recommended that Option 1 is approved for City officers to develop to Gateway 5.</i>	<i>Not recommended</i>
46. Reasons	Improvement of a publicly accessible garden in the City funded from external sources.	Too expensive and not considered to offer additional benefit.