CABINET
TO FOLLOW DOCUMENTS – LIFE CENTRE

DATE: TUESDAY 18 DECEMBER 2007
TIME: 2.30 PM
PLACE: COUNCIL HOUSE, PLYMOUTH

Members—
Councillor Mrs Pengelly, Chair
Councillor Fry, Vice Chair
Councillors Bowyer, Brookshaw, Mrs Ford, Jordan, Michael Leaves, Monahan,
Dr. Salter and Wigens

I refer to the above agenda and attach the reports on The Life Centre
referred to items 8 and 15 (Part II) which were shown as ‘to follow’.

BARRY KEEL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE
CABINET

CABINET MEMBERS: COUNCILLORS BOWYER AND JORDAN

8. THE LIFE CENTRE - CENTRAL PARK (Pages 1 - 8)

CMT Lead Officer: Directors for Community Services and Corporate Resources

PART II (PRIVATE MEETING)

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO NOTE

That under the law, the Committee is entitled to consider certain items in private. Members of the public will be asked to leave the meeting when such items are discussed.

CABINET MEMBERS: COUNCILLORS BOWYER AND JORDAN

15. THE LIFE CENTRE – CENTRAL PARK (E3) (Pages 9 - 46)

CMT Lead Officers: Directors for Community Services and Corporate Resources
Executive Summary:

This paper is for the Cabinet to recommend increased funding, the creation of a project board and to instruct officers to now deliver the Life Centre. The recommended facility mix will contain the following:

- Ice rink
- 50M Pool
- Diving Pool
- Dryside Diving provision
- Leisure water
- Multi-purpose space
- Crèche/soft play
- Indoor bowls
- Sports Hall
- Fitness Suite
- Health Suite
- Climbing Facilities
- Catering
- Facilities for Health Clinics

The Life Centre will be an impressive regional facility. It will be a magnet attracting not only elite performers of all disciplines but the public at large. It will be a place that will inspire, excite and engage people of all ages and encourage them to lead healthy lifestyles. More specifically it will:

- increase active participation across the city. The project will seek to build on the Local Area Agreement Stretch Target of a projected increase in activity (3 x 30 minutes a week) from the current 18.6% in April 2007 to 22.6% in April 2010; and to maintain a 1% year on year increase in activity levels thereafter
- attract over 1 million attendances a year
• improve the uptake in activity levels by priority customers; Children and Young People, Older People, and those living in the most deprived wards
• provide facilities which are designed to be fully inclusive and accessible ensuring that all the needs of our citizens are met
• create high levels of customer satisfaction, with the quality of facilities and services provided
• provide a regional centre which meets the sports needs of our elite performers, ensuring that Plymouth remains one of the top sports hub in the South West
• provide a destination which partnerships can utilise to increase the skills, coaching and volunteer workforce across the city
• to build low carbon and energy efficient facilities, which coupled with its ability to attract more users and more income, will ensure than running costs are no higher than the current facilities located within the Park
• provide an attractive destination that will be an enjoyable place for people to visit

The key benefits are outlined below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key performance indicator</th>
<th>Strategic Fit</th>
<th>Current position</th>
<th>Output year two of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Adult population undertaking physical activity 3 x 30 mins.</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 1 2020 Partnership</td>
<td>2006 (18.6%)</td>
<td>2011 (23.6%) LAA Stretch Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual attendance throughput</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 1 2020 Partnership</td>
<td>620,000 (Mayflower LC, CCP, Ice &amp; water Pavilions)</td>
<td>1,000,000 visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create high levels of customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Corporate Plan: Objective 3</td>
<td>63% satisfaction Active England</td>
<td>70% (above national average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use cultural and leisure activities to actively promote purposeful alternatives to crime and anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 3 2020 Partnership</td>
<td>2.5 hours (currently one evening)</td>
<td>6 hours per week (on at least two occasions across all core facility components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To replace leisure facilities within Central Park</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 8 2020 Partnership</td>
<td>2.5 x facilities in need of replacement</td>
<td>Deployment of new facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of nationally accredited leisure service standards and programmes</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 8 2020 Partnership/ Corporate Plan Objective 2</td>
<td>No Quest accredited facilities</td>
<td>QUEST and IIP accredited venue or equal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the inclusion of the Life Centre in the Capital Programme in March 2007, work commenced with Sport England to embark on a new needs analysis for the City in
conjunction with the opportunity for the Life Centre to receive grant funding as a Community Sports Hub. The work with Sport England began in April of 2007 and was completed in September 2007. The initial cost estimates have grown due to the inclusion of additional facilities (namely bowling and climbing facilities) together with increased allowances for transport infrastructure and general contingency and risk. The Sport England Community Sports Hub model calls for an annual “dowry” to be created from commercial development opportunities on site. This has proved to be very difficult to realise in Central Park. We will continue to work with Sport England to achieve some grant funding however this report seeks approval for additional funding to be made available by the Council for the recommended facility.

It is recommended that a budget of £44.00m is created for this scheme due to its scale and therefore risks associated with it.

The previous estimated cost of £26.6m can be put into context thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous estimate</td>
<td>26.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Additional Infrastructure &amp; Facilities allowance (highways,</td>
<td>14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowling centre, increased dry sports facilities) &amp; additional risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Cost variation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional allowance for fees (architecture &amp; sustainability)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional inflation</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional allowance for operator fittings</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporate Plan 2007-2010:

The Corporate Plan (2007-2010) clearly highlights that there will be a focus “on improving our cultural and leisure facilities including proposals for a significant sports and recreation development at Central Park”.

Three corporate objectives will shape the new facilities and service provided:

- Corporate objective 2: “Providing excellent and efficient services”: We will seek to provide a ‘best value operator’ who demonstrates effectiveness and efficiency in delivering a value for money, operation combined with nationally accredited service outputs
- Corporate objective 3: “Putting the customer first”: Research work undertaken with Sport England (Active People) clearly highlights our customer base for the new facility. We will ensure that the new facilities and programmes meet our customer needs
- Corporate objective 4: “Ensuring access for all”: Facility design, prices, fees and programmes will demonstrate a commitment to fair access

Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:
Including finance, human, IT and land.

The Life Centre project was placed in the Capital Programme following recommendation by Council in March 2007 and challenge from Resources and Performance Scrutiny Panel.

The scheme has now been sufficiently worked up, following the work with Sport England, to be re-submitted to Cabinet for further necessary decision by Cabinet. The latest scheme has changed significantly in financial terms from that outlined in March 2007.

Capital

This is a major capital project and there is a risk that the costs may fluctuate. Hence an allowance of +10% has been built into the estimates. The potential costs of the project are now estimated at £44.00m.
The revised latest estimate of the capital cost of the scheme and the funding profile are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allocated in Programme</th>
<th>Revised Financing Requirement</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Receipts</td>
<td>£14.681</td>
<td>£24.500</td>
<td>£9.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupported Borrowing</td>
<td>£9.000</td>
<td>£15.000</td>
<td>£6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contributions</td>
<td>£2.500</td>
<td>£4.000</td>
<td>£1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106</td>
<td>£0.500</td>
<td>£0.500</td>
<td>£0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£26.681</strong></td>
<td><strong>£44.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£17.319</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition it is recommended that the Council commits to funding improvements in Central Park as outlined in the Central Park Area Action Plan deliberated at Council on December 10 by the agreed timeframe of 2016. This is to be achieved by utilising funds raised through enabling development, prioritising the Life Centre. A broad-brush initial estimate of the capital costs of this estimate of the capital costs of this element of the scheme is £5m – this is outside the life of the existing three-year capital programme but should be noted as a further financial commitment. The final options for the funding of this element of the scheme and any revenue implications will be presented back to Cabinet at a future date.

Other Implications: e.g. Section 17 Community Safety, Health and Safety, Risk Management, Equalities Impact Assessment, etc.

The details of any proposed scheme will address any current Health and Safety issues. The other major issue that will be addressed by implementing the Life Centre project will be that of full compliance with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act. In addition, the project provides for improvements to the park that are aimed to increase the numbers of people participating in sporting activity, bring more visitors to Central Park and therefore improved natural surveillance improving community safety.

The project implementation document will incorporate a full risk management exercise.
Recommendations & Reasons for recommended action:

Members are asked to endorse the recommendations of this document, which are as follows:

1. To approve option B1 as the preferred scheme for the Life Centre, subject to planning consent.

2. To approve the funding options, subject to funding allocations being set through the Capital Programme Board and approval of the Capital Programme Budget by Council.

3. To approve the setting up of a Project Board including stakeholders and political representatives that has the delegated authority to make all operational decisions on the Life Centre project.

4. Cabinet is asked to authorise officers to develop the project, through the project board, including the procurement, design, and construction and that authority to let consultant and construction contracts be delegated to the Directors of Corporate Resources and Community Services, Head of Asset Management and Head of Strategic Procurement, in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Asset Management and Leisure and the Project Board, in order that procurement can proceed without the need to continually refer technical and procedural matters back to Cabinet.

5. To approve the ring fencing of additional receipts from enabling development identified in the Central Park Area Action Plan, after prioritising the Life Centre, for Park Improvements. Such improvements will be subject to a separate study estimated provisionally as a £5m scheme, which would involve funds generated from receipts involving the Outland Road / Peverell Park Road Scheme, PAFC’s stadium developments, the Environment Centre and Housing to be achieved within the AAP Plan Period. Included in the improvements to the park will be the public realm around the Life centre itself.

6. To refer all the recommendations and the report to the Overview & Scrutiny Commission.

7. To ask the Head of Asset Management to bring regular progress reports to Cabinet.
Alternative options considered and reasons for recommended action:

External consultants EC Harris were commissioned to undertake an Option Appraisals considering the alternatives design/facility mix options surrounding the scheme. A total of four options have been considered in the options appraisal process, namely:

- Option A: Basic scheme replacing existing facilities in a like for like manner
- Option B: Mid-range scheme offering a balanced mix of facilities
- Option C: Full Needs Analysis scheme – providing a wide range of facilities and services
- Option B1: Derivative of option B above, but with a different floor layout to provide a building footprint that could be accommodated within the zone identified in the Area Action Plan while allowing the existing facilities to continue until the new is open.

Option B1 was identified as the preferred solution due to the balance of facilities and capital cost. Further details are given in the background paper.

Background papers:

Reference Documents:

Part II Cabinet Paper for the Life centre dated 18th December 2007.
EC Harris Options Appraisal Report dated November 2007 Part II

Sign off:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Fin</th>
<th>HH 7800 09 0712 07</th>
<th>Head of Leg</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>Head of HR</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Head of AM</th>
<th>NTS/ 125/0 7120 7</th>
<th>Head of IT</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Head of Strat Proc</th>
<th>JFC 166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Originating SMT Members; Nalin Seneviratne & James Coulton
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