

Business Case

Reference number:

Project Title: Barton Pavilion

Date: 09th March 2010

Responsible Board: Executive Board

Portfolio Holder: Cllr Bob Timbs

Links to OCC Priority:

- Tackle Inequalities and Support Communities
- Improve the Local Environment, Economy and Quality of Life
- Reduce Crime and Anti-social Behaviour

Sponsor: Ian Brooke/Steve Sprason

Project Manager: Hagan Lewisman and Philip Jones

Project Administrator: Philip Jones

Version No: 0.2

Approvals:

1. City Executive Board
2. [Lindsay Cane](#)
3. [Tim Sadler](#)
4. [Steve Sprason](#)
5. Paul Swaffield
6. Ian Brooke
7. Lorraine Freeman
8. Jane Lubbock
9. Angela Cristofoli

Distribution:

1. CEB
2. NEAC
3. Leisure Delivery Board

Business Case

1. Background

Barton Pavilion is situated within the recreation ground on Barton Village Road and is home to Barton United Football Club, Headington Amateurs Football Club and Barton Bowls club. These three organisations have joined together to form the Phoenix Association who are the current tenant of the pavilion and who manage the facility.

The pavilion and the land belong to Oxford City Council who holds the majority of the maintenance responsibility. The Phoenix Association have a lease over part of the facility, subject to a rent of £4,600 per annum.

The Barton Pavilion project has been in existence for almost a decade. It has been previously highlighted as a challenging project for the Council to deliver, due to the need to harmonise stakeholder aspirations and identify the required finance. The key issues are highlighted in the sections below.

1.1 Improve the quality of the sports pavilion facility within Barton

The pavilion itself is currently not fit for purpose, as it is in a very poor state of repair. It was scored as only 24% (very poor) in the Sport England Non Technical Survey that the Council undertook in November 2009. The pavilion does not meet relevant Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and Child Protection guidance. It also does not meet Sport England or Football Association recommendations.

1.2 High maintenance backlog of existing facility

This current facility is over 30 years old and is in a very poor state of repair. There is a maintenance backlog of approximately £309K. The completion of these works would still not meet all of the necessary guidance from Sport England and the Football Association. Due to the age of the facility any works to the building are likely to uncover additional issues that require additional works and inflate maintenance costs for the future. The closure of the existing pavilion and the replacement with a good quality, 'fit for purpose' facility will remove this ongoing maintenance liability.

1.3 The current management arrangements are not sustainable

The Phoenix Association have a lease over part of the facility, subject to a rent of £4,600 per annum. These arrangements are not sustainable as the Phoenix Association are applying to the Council for grants to pay for this lease.

1.4 Proposed housing development extension to Barton

There is a proposed housing development extension to Barton. If approved, it is likely to impact on the Barton Recreation ground area. This means that any development must be flexible to allow for possible relocation/remodelling, as well as providing good value for money.

1.5 Ground requirements do not meet Football Association standards for Hellenic Division 1

Headington Amateurs Football Club currently play in Hellenic Division 1. Teams within the league need to meet the football pyramid stage six requirements, otherwise this could result in Headington Amateurs being relegated to another lower level league if the ground

does not meet the required standard by summer 2011. The requirements include enclosing the ground, a fit for purpose club house that provides refreshments on match days, flood lighting, turnstile and covered spectator accommodation on two sides of the ground.

1.6 Additional background information

The project is to provide a sustainable multi-purpose sports pavilion which includes changing facilities, toilets, bar / social area, which meets relevant industry guidance.

Oxford City Council appointed Sports Solutions Great Britain (SSGB) in 2009 to undertake an options review, consultation with relevant groups including local Councillors, the Phoenix Association (including all the relevant clubs), Barton Community Association and the Football Association, carry out an options appraisal and recommend the best way forward.

In light of the need to be flexible due to the potential future housing development and in order to provide the most benefit to all the clubs within available funding, it is recommended to proceed with option 5 (page 8), which is the provision of a replacement pavilion of modular design on the existing site. These modular designs are used in all areas of business, industry and sport, giving a durable and high quality facility for a relatively low cost

Manufacturers have confirmed that the modular facilities are generally as hard wearing as permanent structures and are guaranteed for twelve years and have a sixty year life span. The pavilion target date for completion is by the end of October 2010 subject to funding. This means that there may be some initial disruption to clubs. The Oxfordshire Football Association has advised that fixtures could be moved or played away during this period to minimise disruption.

Headington Amateurs or the Phoenix Association unfortunately do not have any funds that they could use towards the new pavilion or towards meeting the stage six criteria for ground grading. There is no obligation for a Council to provide a ground to this level as there are already three facilities meeting this level or above within the City which could possibly be used for ground shares, although the league are not entirely comfortable with this. These added to the longer term uncertainty for the recreation ground would mean that it would be very unlikely to be able to fund the necessary ground improvements to stage six at this time.

It is important that the management arrangements for the new facility are reviewed, along with the lease arrangements to ensure the pavilion is sustainable to all parties. It is important that the facility is open to the community throughout the week to ensure additional profit to cover the cost and provide an important community facility.

2. Project Definition

2.1 Project Objectives

- To provide a modern, flexible sports pavilion, that is sustainable and meets relevant industry guidance.

2.2 Project Deliverables

- A design & build team procured and appointed by end of May 2010
- Planning permission in place by July 2010
- New management agreement in place by August 2010
- New pavilion built and opened by November 2010.

2.3 Project Benefits

Benefits	Direct	Indirect	Financial	Non-financial
<i>Increased usage</i>	✓			✓
<i>Improved quality of facility</i>	✓			✓
<i>Revenue Savings</i>	✓		✓	
<i>Flexible provision (ahead of the Barton housing development)</i>	✓			✓
<i>Disability Discrimination Act Compliant</i>	✓			✓

2.4 Project Scope and Exclusions

It is unlikely that any funding can be sought for ground improvements due to the proposed housing development. The project excludes the need for the ground to meet the FA step 6 grading requirements.

2.5 Constraints

- The deliver the project in November 2010.
- Delivering the project with minimised interference on the football season.
- The confirmation of the remaining funding which is outside of OCC control.

2.6 Assumptions

- That OCC can agree terms of lease with a suitable tenant (BCA or PSA)
- That full funding is achieved.
- That procurement timescales are achieved.

2.7 Interdependencies

- Future Barton housing development
- Barton Project Group

3. Project Options

3.1 Option 1 - Do Nothing

This option looks at continuing with the current pavilion. This option will ultimately lead to no provision as the facility will close due to on-going maintenance concerns.

3.1.1 Advantages

- Saving of any capital cost. There are currently £50k Council funds allocated against the 10/11 budget.

3.1.2 Disadvantages

a) Anti Social Behaviour

- The current facility is plagued by ASB, partly because the local community have no ownership of it and partly due to its low quality (low perceived value).

b) Health inequalities on Barton

- Allowing this facility to decline and close due to lack of investment would remove an important sporting facility from Barton. This facility is host to both junior and adult teams which would cease to operate without a pavilion.
- Participation in sports and leisure on Barton would be decreased and have an effect on the levels of obesity.

c) High Maintenance Costs

- The current maintenance backlog is estimated at £309k. Even with the completion of these works the facility will not meet relevant industry guidance.

d) Low Quality Facilities

- The current facility has a very poor rating from the sport England assessment. This would not change.
- There have been numerous comments made on the state of the facility by visiting sports teams and members of the public

e) Decreased Reputation of OCC in Barton

- The pavilion project has been ongoing for almost a decade.
- Closure of the facility would reflect badly on the council

f) Section 106 funding pot would be lost

- There is Section 106 money for allocated Barton pavilion project which OCC would be unable to reallocate if unspent.

3.1.3 Conclusion of Option 1

This option would require little in capital costs, but OCC would end up spending almost £300k on repairs over the coming years. As a result this option is not viable to the council.

3.2 Option 2 – Close Barton Pavilion

This option looks at closing the current pavilion immediately and not providing any further offering in the area.

3.2.1 Advantages

- Saving of any capital cost. This has been estimated at approximately £350k.
- Removal of maintenance liabilities that are approximately £309K.

3.2.2 Disadvantages

a) Health inequalities on Barton

- Closing this facility due to lack of investment would remove an important sporting facility from Barton. This facility is host to both junior and adult teams which would cease to operate without a pavilion.
- Participation in sports and leisure on Barton would be decreased and have an effect on the levels of obesity.

b) Lack of Facilities

- There would be no outdoor sports facilities left on Barton which could be used for adult sports.

c) Decreased Reputation of OCC in Barton

- The pavilion project has been ongoing for almost a decade.
- Closure of the facility would reflect badly on the council.

d) Section 106 funding pot would be lost

- There is Section 106 money for a Barton pavilion project which OCC would be unlikely to reallocate if unspent.

e) Clubs may fold

- With the loss of a local facility it is likely that the clubs would fold or move out of the area.

3.2.3 Conclusion of Option 2

This option would remove an important sporting venue, would inflict badly upon the reputation of the City Council and could lead to the clubs folding.

3.3 Option 3 – Rebuild on same footprint

This option looks at demolishing and rebuilding the pavilion in the same place as it currently is. This option would be expensive with SSGB indicating approximate costs of £900K.

3.3.1 Advantages

- Would provide a high quality, purpose built facility
- Would fulfil community expectations and help to raise OCC's profile in the area.
- Would fulfil all legislative requirements.
- Would offer an improved facility to maximise participation and helping to tackle health inequalities

3.3.2 Disadvantages

a) Anti Social Behaviour

- The current facility is plagued by ASB, partly because the local community have no ownership of it and partly due to its low quality (low perceived value).
- This facility would be in the same place, with sheltered supervision

b) Flexibility

- The proposed housing development is likely to impact on the recreation ground in some way, and could require the moving of the pavilion.
- It would be difficult and very costly to move a brick building.

c) Amount of investment

- The capital investment required would be approximately £900k. This would be a large investment for OCC to find and would be approximately £575,000 more than the secured funds.
- OCC would find it very difficult to secure funding against facility with its uncertain future.

3.3.3 Conclusion of Option 3

This option would not give the flexibility required for the housing development and is also a costly option that OCC would be unlikely to secure funding against.

3.4 Option 4 – Rebuild on a different part of recreation ground

This option looks at demolishing and rebuilding the pavilion on a different location on the recreation ground. This option would be expensive with SSGB indicating approximate costs of £900K.

3.4.1 Advantages

- Would provide a high quality, purpose built facility
- Would fulfil community expectations and help to raise OCC's profile in the area.
- Would fulfil all legislative requirements.
- Would offer an improved facility to maximise participation and helping to tackle health inequalities
- Would counter ASB issues as facility could be moved to provide improved natural supervision.

3.4.2 Disadvantages

a) Flexibility

- The proposed housing development is likely to impact on the recreation ground in some way, and could require the moving of the pavilion.
- If the pavilion was to be removed for a housing development it could have a negative effect on the reputation of OCC.
- Although the pavilion would be sited in a different area there are currently no confirmed plans for the housing development.

b) Amount of investment

- The capital investment required would be approximately £900k. This would be a large investment for OCC to find and would be approximately £575,000 more than the secured funds.
- OCC would find it very difficult to secure funding against facility with its uncertain future.
- Services to the new facility would need to be added, which would increase the cost.

c) Planning issues

- Residents could object to the re-sited pavilion which could hinder the planning for the project.

3.4.3 Conclusion of Option 4

This option similar to option 3 would be expensive and be difficult to obtain funding for.

3.5 Option 5 – Refurbish Current Pavilion

This option looks at refurbishing the current pavilion to bring it to a suitable standard for the teams using the pavilion. The maintenance backlog has been calculated to £309,000, but this option could mean that the pavilion is refurbished to a level slightly below this standard.

3.5.1 Advantages

- The cost of the project could be staged or limited to suit the funding options available.

3.5.2 Disadvantages

a) Flexibility

- The proposed housing development is likely to impact on the recreation ground in some way, and could require the moving of the pavilion.
- If the pavilion was to be removed for a housing development it could have a negative effect on the reputation of OCC.

b) Internal remodelling

- This option would require a large amount of internal remodelling in order to satisfy legislative requirements.

c) Community

- This option would not satisfy the community expectations for the project. This would impact badly on the city councils reputation in the area.

3.5.3 Conclusion of Option 5

This option would not be recommended as even with significant investment the facility would still not meet relevant industry guidance and it may also be impacted by the proposed housing development.

3.6 Option 6 – Use alternative facilities

This option would mean that the clubs would use alternative facilities in the area and the pavilion could be demolished in order to make revenue savings.

3.6.1 Advantages

- There would be no capital cost to the option.
- There would be a longer term revenue saving.

3.6.2 Disadvantages

a) Suitable facilities

- The only suitable facility in the area would be the Barton neighbourhood centre.
- The BNC is too far away from the pitches to be viable for the clubs to use.
- The FA and the league would not feel this situation would be appropriate and as such the clubs would not meet the ground grading requirements.

b) Community

- This option would not fulfil community expectations and would impact badly on the reputation of the city council.

c) Clubs may fold

- With the loss of a local facility it is likely that the clubs would fold or move out of the area.

d) Section 106 funding pot would be lost

- There is Section 106 money for a Barton pavilion project which OCC would be unlikely to reallocate if unspent.

3.6.3 Conclusion of Option 6

This option would not be recommended to deliver the project as it would mean that the football clubs would not be able to operate to an acceptable standard. There would also be a strong likelihood that the clubs may fold or move from the area, as well as the potential loss of the developer contribution.

3.7 Option 7 – Temporary/Modular facility

This option would be to provide a modular facility in place of the current pavilion. The current building would be demolished and the modular facility would initially be installed on the same footprint. This would cost approximately £350k.

3.7.1 Advantages

- The modular facility gives a great deal of flexibility as it can be moved at any time.
- The facility would be purpose built to a defined specification.
- The facility would satisfy all legislative requirements which would help the two clubs to develop, adding female teams as well as more juniors.
- This would lead to greater participation in the estate both in activity and socially. It would also help to tackle health inequalities and issues such as obesity.
- The S106 money would be used and not lost.
- Improved reputation of OCC as the pavilion would fit with community expectations and would be delivered after a 10 year period of waiting.
- Any modular building would have a long guarantee, normally of around 15 years.
- FA and Hellenic league are comfortable with the modular design as a pavilion.

3.7.2 Disadvantages

a) Perceptions of modular building

- People perceive modular buildings to look like crates and to be purely temporary buildings. The new modular designs can be clad to look like any other building and have a recommended life span of 60 years.

b) ASB

- The pavilion would initially be installed on the same footprint as the current one. This may lead to some anti-social behaviour due to the pavilions positioning. Although measure will be put in place to mitigate against this.

3.7.3 Conclusion of Option 7

This option would deliver the majority of benefits to the project, whilst retaining a flexible solution to any proposed future housing development. The issue of community perceptions can be managed to show that this is a positive step forward and gives flexibility for the future.

3.8 Options Summary

Option	Corporate Priorities					
	Stronger & more inclusive communities	Improve local environment, economy & quality of life	Reduce crime & ASB	VFM	Improve quality of facilities	
1	x	x	x	x	x	-5
2	x	x	x	x	x	-5
3	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	3
4	✓	✓	✓✓	x	✓	4
5	x	x	x	x	x	-5
6	x	x	x	x	x	-5
7	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	6

4. Risks and Uncertainties

*Likelihood: 1 = Rare and 5 = Almost Certain
Impact: 1 = Insignificant and 5 = Catastrophic]*

Risk & Description	Likelihood (Rare/Unlikely/Possible/ Likely/Almost Certain)	Impact (Insignificant/Minor/ Moderate/Major/ Catastrophic)	Counter Measures
Full funding not achieved	2	3	Several funding applications processed for a greater amount than required
Increased future costs, due to management arrangements not being sustainable	2	3	Work with BCA and PA to confirm new management arrangements prior to new facility opening
Project impacts on football season	3	2	Matches can be moved and season extension can be agreed with the league
Increased cost and delay in program due to ground and asbestos survey results throwing up issues	3	3	Barton Project group set up, ground surveys to be completed by May.

5. Project Plan – High Level Milestones

Milestone	Start	Finish	Milestone/ decision point	Milestone Termination Point
Procurement of design and build company	April 10	May 10		
Planning permission obtained	May 10	July 10		
Management agreement finalised	Jun 10	Aug 10		
Lease finalised	Jun 10	Aug 10		
Initial build off site	Jul 10	Sept 10		
Final build on site	Sept 10	Nov 10		

6. Whole Life Cost / Sustainability

By replacing the Barton pavilion with a modular design, the Council will improve the quality of leisure and sports facilities in an area of deprivation and remove the current maintenance liability. The project will help engage the community within Barton, aid social cohesion and help tackle social issues such as health and well-being and crime and anti-social behaviour in and around estate.

The new pavilion will become wholly sustainable with the management ensuring that income generation is enough to cover all rent, maintenance and utilities. In order to do this the facility will be open to the wider community throughout the week.

The modular design has a life expectancy of 60 years with a 15 year guarantee. This will make the facility effectively recyclable as it can be relocated where necessary during its lifetime.

7. Equalities Impact Assessment

The new facility will be fully accessible and be compliant to the DDA. It will also be compliant with child protection regulations meaning that the sports clubs can offer a larger range of service including women's and girls teams and a larger number of boys teams.

The facility will also be open to the entire community as a social and sporting hub. It will provide an important social venue that will help bring the community together and also involve the community in supporting the local clubs.

8. Business Case (Costs and Benefits)

Costs	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Capital costs	£0	£292,000	£	£
Employees	£0	£0	£	£
Running expenses	£0	£0	£	£
Technology	£0	£0	£	£
Maintenance and Support	£0	£0	£	£
Other (e.g. Training, Data Load, Conversion, Backfill)	£0	£0	£	£
Contingency (20%)	£0	£58,000	£	£
Total cost of project	£0	£350000	£	£
Total funding required (for costs not met by the Service)	£0	£	£	£

Expected Benefits	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Rental income	£	£5000	£5000	£5000
[Text: e.g., efficiencies benefits]	£	£	£	£

Net Savings (benefits minus costs)	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Maintenance savings	£	£7000	£7000	£7000

9. Business Case Commentary

- The proposed cost of the facility is approximately £292k. This is to design, obtain planning permission, complete ground works, build and commission a facility.
- This cost also covers the facility with a 15 year guarantee from the manufacturing company
- A 20% contingency has taken the project cost up to £350k.
- The revenue income from the facility would be the rent that the tenant pays based on the rateable value of the building.
- The savings made would be in relation to the maintenance and utilities that OCC currently have responsibility for. As the new management agreement would take full responsibility for these this would positively impact the OCC revenue line.

10. Procurement Route

- The preferred option is to procure a company that will design and build the full facility, taking it through planning and consultation and taking responsibility for ground works and utilities connections.
- Applications will go out via the tender process which should take 1 month from putting an invite out.