

REPORT TITLE: PAVILION PROJECT UPDATE

20 SEPTEMBER 2017

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM Cllr Anne Weir

Contact Officer: Eloise Appleby, Assistant Director (Economy & Communities) Tel  
No: 01962 848 181 Email: eappleby@winchester.gov.uk

WARD(S): ST BARTHOLOMEW

PURPOSE

Following the decision by the Council to build the new leisure centre at Bar End, there has been a keen desire to progress the replacement of the dilapidated and outdated cricket pavilion at North Walls. A budget of £300,000 was allocated for this purpose from the Winchester Town Account (CAB2763 (Revised), Budget and Council Tax 2016/17- 18 February 2016 refers).

Local residents approached Members of Town Forum to propose that the new pavilion take the form of a bespoke facility which would be locally distinctive, meeting the required standards of the English Cricket Board whilst offering the potential for some more flexible use by the community.

The delivery of the proposed community-led design – produced as a *pro bono* contribution by Winchester-based AR Design Studio – was originally estimated at a cost of £600,000. Members agreed to give the community group behind the scheme, now known as The Pavilion Project, some time to raise the additional funds needed and to explore other aspects of the operation of such a facility (WTF231 – Proposed Replacement Pavilion at North Walls, 21 September 2016 refers).

This report provides a written update on the project, building on previous oral reports to Winchester Town Forum, and seeks feedback from Members on the preferred way forward.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A decision about next steps be taken, based on the two options set out at paragraph 10.8 of the Report;

2. Dependant on the next steps, consideration be given to the total capital budget, currently set at £300,000, noting that any additional budget will require funding to be sourced, and also that any revenue implications of the scheme will also require consideration.
3. Should the second option (ie the AR Design scheme) continue to be supported, and the necessary funding identified for delivery of the scheme, then in order to deliver the project effectively the following steps be approved:
  - i) Delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) to ensure that the design is modified as necessary, so as to meet Council standards for ongoing repair and maintenance requirements;
  - ii) A Direction under Contracts Procedure Rule 2.4(a) be made in relation to the employment of AR Design Studio as project architects.

IMPLICATIONS:1 COUNCIL STRATEGY OUTCOME

- 1.1 The Pavilion Project supports the corporate outcome of 'improving the health and happiness of our community', specifically the aims of:
- a) Promoting active communities by supporting programmes accessible to all residents to encourage increased physical activity across the District;
    - *The new pavilion will be fully accessible to all users, unlike the current one. It will encourage use by new users (including more cricket and other sports clubs) because it will be attractive, modern and well laid out.*
  - b) Providing new leisure facilities in Winchester Town that meet the needs of a broad cross section of our communities;
    - *Cricket is enjoying a upsurge of popularity, fuelled in part by the success of the national women's team. Locally, there is keen interest in participation in the sport by players with disabilities, girls' teams and leisure cricketers, showing some of the breadth of community appeal a new facility would have. However, as a result of public consultation and fundraising, the proposed pavilion could also cater for other sports uses and community activities, reaching an even wider cross section of the local population.*
  - c) Encouraging volunteering to support and extend local services
    - *The Pavilion Project has been proposed and led entirely by local volunteers, drawing on their professional skills and leisure interests to draw up plans, submit funding bids, organise community events and maintain media awareness of the proposals.*

2 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1 A budget of £300,000 was allocated for this purpose from the Winchester Town Account (CAB2763 (Revised), Budget and Council Tax 2016/17- 18 February 2016 refers). Approval from Cabinet to release this money would be required under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4, following consideration of a business case (Town Forum have power to authorise for this purpose only up to £25,000).
- 2.2 A further report to both the Town Forum and Cabinet will be required to include a full financial appraisal of the capital and revenue consequences of the proposed final scheme.
- 2.3 If the community-led design option is progressed further, then a business case, including a detailed risk assessment of the proposed organisational

structure and the income and expenditure projections, will be required before final sign off.

Report WTF231 – Proposed Replacement Pavilion at North Walls, 21 September 2016 - set out the estimated costings for three options for delivering the new pavilion as follows: <b>Replacement Option</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Funding by S106 monies already received by WCC</b>	<b>Funding by Winchester Town Forum (Winchester Town Reserve)</b>	<b>Additional funding to be raised</b>
a) Like for like  (ie meeting minimum standards and with same floor area)	£220,000	£176,000	£44,000	Nil
b) Community-led design  (ie AR Design Studio's proposed plan, floor area increased e from 144m2 to 275m2)	£610,000	£256,000	£44,000	£310,000
c) Enhanced 'like for like'  (ie an alternative design commissioned by the Council – increased floor area but less iconic design)	£380,000	£256,000	£44,000	£80,000

- 2.4 In discussions with The Pavilion Project team, it had been indicated that costs for their proposed scheme (option b above) could be 'value engineered' to a figure closer to £500,000, and that third party grants and sponsorship would then fill the funding gap. However, the Council's Estates Team commissioned external cost consultants to assess the cost of the proposals and the report received earlier this month indicated that a budget of £800,000 would be more realistic for the proposed designs. This has arrived very recently and has not been discussed with the Pavilion Project nor with AR Design who produced the scheme.
- 2.5 The Pavilion Project team have had an active programme of community fundraising, generating nearly £15,000 thus far in cash and pledges. They have also explored the options to apply for grants from other bodies.
- 2.6 A bid was made to Sport England for £150,000 in the spring, and a grant offer offer of £50,000 has been made. This is still subject to contract and is not

confirmed until the contract has been signed. Sport England were enthusiastic about the project, but their grants programme was very oversubscribed and there was a long delay in announcing the awards offers.

- 2.7 Other grant-making bodies have required evidence of planning permission being obtained before being able to consider an application, so the focus over the summer has been on making an application for planning consent.
- 2.8 The Pavilion Project are currently awaiting a decision from the Charities Commission regarding an application for charitable status as a Community Interest Company. Securing this status will make the group eligible to apply to other funding bodies.
- 2.9 The need for planning permission and charitable status have served to slow down the fundraising effort since the spring. Whilst this does mean that the community-led design option is significantly under-funded at the present time, the Pavilion Project team have been laying the foundations over the summer for a stronger fundraising programme and the Sport England offer will boost confidence with other potential funders and sponsors.
- 2.10 Section 5 below refers to concerns from the Estates Team that the community-led design will incur higher maintenance, repair and running costs, which would fall to the Town Account.

### 3 LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The Pavilion Project is clear that any new facility would be the property and responsibility of the Council, however it came into being. In line with Contracts Procedure Rules, officers would seek competitive tenders for construction. The Estates Team would also manage delivery of the project on behalf of their internal clients, the Landscapes and Open Spaces Team.
- 3.2 The Estates Team would usually also seek competitive quotations for the architectural design of the scheme. The Council's commissioning process (approved by Members in April 2011: CAB2153 – Introducing a Commission Approach refers) allows for unsolicited approaches to be made to the Council in relation to proposed commissions. In considering such approaches, Members are able to agree exceptions to Contracts Procedure Rules where it is felt that there is a reasonable justification to do so. In a case like this, for example, the design concepts for the pavilion would be the intellectual property of the architect and could not simply be offered to another architect to deliver, but the actual construction works would still be tendered out as above.
- 3.3 The estimated cost of designing a scheme of this size is relatively modest at around £15,000 (normally three quotations would be required for a fee of this size). Formal Member approval would be required to waive the procurement requirement for the architectural design, either through a report or by a Portfolio Holder Decision Notice.

- 3.4 However, the Town Forum can still choose to commission its own design, described as the 'enhanced like for like' option at paragraph 2.1 above. In doing so, it can specify the budget available for the build and ensure that the architects work to the budget from the outset.
- 3.5 Whichever option is selected by Town Forum, planning permission will be required. Planning officers have given informal advice that the community-led scheme presents no obvious policy concerns. In order to enable further funding bids, AR Design drafted a planning application for its proposed design earlier this month. This does not commit the Council to proceeding with the design.

#### 4 WORKFORCE IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The commissioning and delivery of a new project requires staffing resources from across the Council, most notably in this case Estates and Landscapes and Open Spaces. Colleagues from other Teams such as Corporate Communications, Legal and Finance would also have a role to play in ensuring a well-supported and well-managed project, whichever design is chosen.
- 4.2 If the new facility became popular for non-cricket uses (eg small community meetings, children's parties, other sports uses) there would be a need for bookings systems and policies to be established, and arrangements made for community access (eg key holders), additional cleaning etc. This is likely to generate some additional work at the outset, but should evolve into a pattern which does not require extensive additional officer time. At the current time it is not felt that this could be accommodated within the Landscapes and Open Spaces Team, but there are other options that could be pursued (e.g. community-led management). This can be considered at a later date; the first focus for Members is to secure an affordable replacement of the current pavilion.

#### 5 PROPERTY AND ASSET IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 As referenced at paragraph 3.1 above, the pavilion would be the property of the City Council, requiring a regular programme of maintenance, repair and cleaning.
- 5.2 Whilst this is the case for the existing pavilion, officers in the Estates Team have expressed concerns that the proposed design will attract a higher maintenance cost, which would fall to the Town Account. This is largely because they do not feel that it is as durable or vandal-proof as a public facility of this kind in a relatively remote location needs to be. These concerns have been shared with the architects but the planning application does not reflect the kind of modifications that the Estates Team would have wished to see. This does not mean that some minor modifications could not be made following the planning decision, however. Indeed, it is recommended that Town Forum give delegated authority to secure any such modifications to the

design as are necessary to meet the standards acceptable to the Estates Team.

## 6 CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

- 6.1 The Pavilion Project have led a continued programme of engagement, linked to an active community fund-raising campaign. Communications have included the creation of a website ([www.thepavilionproject.com](http://www.thepavilionproject.com)), along with Facebook and Twitter profiles.
- 6.2 Media coverage has included items in the local press, and a feature in the Architects' Journal in November 2016. In June 2017 an item on the project was recorded by Freeview Channel *That's Solent TV*.
- 6.3 Consultation activity has included an exhibition of the proposed concept and design was held in the existing cricket pavilion during Hyde 900's King Alfred weekend in late October 2016, which was well attended, and again at the 2017 King Alfred's Trophy cricket matches at North Walls Recreation Ground in April 2017 and the Women's Cricket Festival in August 2017. Feedback on the designs is logged and fed back to the Pavilion Project team for consideration. These have included considerations around security, maintenance and other potential uses for the building.
- 6.4 This year has also seen a programme of fundraising events, from wine-tastings and quiz nights to the sell-out Hyde Ball and these have jointly served the purpose of raising money and awareness of the project.
- 6.5 2000 Christmas cards were hand-delivered to homes and local pubs in central Winchester in December 2016, promoting the project and encouraging fundraising via the EasyFundraising and MyDonate sites.
- 6.6 St Bede's and Winnall Primary Schools have been consulted on the plans and expressed support, identifying a number of ways that the new facilities might be helpful to their own programmes of activity during the school year.
- 6.7 At a strategic level, the Pavilion Project have had continued discussions with the ECB (England & Wales Cricket Board), and have met with the HCB (Hampshire Cricket Board) who have been most helpful, offering useful advice.
- 6.8 The Pavilion Project continues to liaise with the Chair of Winchester Town Forum and local Ward Members, as well as with relevant officers.

## 7 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The new Pavilion would enhance the environment through its design, but also by enabling the removal of the two dilapidated buildings currently on the site. There are no additional environmental impacts anticipated from the project.

## 8 EQUALITY IMPACT

- 8.1 The current pavilion does not meet the standard for disability access set out in the ECB standards. The new facility would ensure full access for those with mobility difficulties, including ramped access, a single-level and single-storey interior, and accessible showers, toilets and kitchen spaces. Score boards will be operated remotely, and will not present access challenges as a result. There has been a good response to the Pavilion Project from organisations involved in running disability cricket initiatives in the area.

## 9 RISK MANAGEMENT

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>
<p><i>Property</i></p> <p>Delivery of a bespoke design that enjoys community support but that does not meet Estates standards for maintenance and durability could give rise to additional expense and officer time over the long term.</p>	<p>Ongoing discussions are taking place with AR Design about their design proposals.</p> <p>Members are asked to delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) to ensure that the final design for the facility meets these standards.</p>	
<p><i>Community Support</i></p> <p>A high level of community support for the Pavilion Project may mean that a final decision on options does not take into account other factors such as running costs, durability, management procedures, contractual constraints (e.g. for the cleaning contract).</p>	<p>Members are asked to take these factors into consideration through formal reports to Town Forum.</p>	<p>Objective external advisors could be invited to comment on the preferred option to assess these factors and seek to quantify the potential costs for Member consideration.</p>
<p><i>Timescales</i></p> <p>Ongoing delay in delivery of the new pavilion, resulting in vandalism, reputational damage to the Council and frustration among users and local residents.</p>	<p>The continued programme of community engagement has attempted to demonstrate that a new facility is in the pipeline.</p>	<p>A final decision by Town Forum on the preferred replacement option would help to move the project forward.</p>



<p><i>Financial / VfM</i></p> <p>Failure to secure funding for delivery of the community-led design, resulting in a different approach which does not meet raised community expectations.</p> <p>Community sports pavilions are regularly vandalised. Failure to adapt the design to remove elements which are prone to vandalism will result in increased maintenance costs and a loss of availability if vandal damage results in the temporary closure of the building.</p>	<p>A planning application is being submitted by the Pavilion Project to improve the chances of securing external grants for the community-led design</p> <p>Consider modifying the design to remove elements which will be prone to vandalism</p>	<p>Town Account CIL funds could be used to close any remaining budget gaps</p>
<p><i>Reputation</i></p> <p>As indicated in other risk areas above, there are reputational risks associated with ongoing inaction in relation to the replacement of the facility as well as from selecting an option for implementation that attracts ongoing challenges such as vandalism or poor durability.</p>	<p>Issues are being identified as thoroughly as possible in order for Members to make a decision on the preferred way forward at this meeting.</p>	

## 10 SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

- 10.1 Following the decision by the Council to build the new leisure centre at Bar End, there was a keen desire to progress the replacement of the dilapidated and outdated cricket pavilion at North Walls. A budget of £300,000 was allocated for this purpose from the Winchester Town Account (CAB2763 (Revised), Budget and Council Tax 2016/17- 18 February 2016 refers).

- 10.2 Local residents approached Members of Town Forum to propose that the new pavilion take the form of a bespoke facility which would be locally distinctive, meeting the required standards of the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB) whilst offering the potential for some more flexible use (eg by other sports clubs).
- 10.3 The delivery of the proposed community-led design – produced as a *pro bono* contribution by Winchester-based AR Design Studio – was originally estimated at a cost of £600,000. Members agreed to give the community group behind the scheme, now known as The Pavilion Project, some time to raise the additional funds needed and to explore other aspects of the operation of such a facility (WTF231 – Proposed Replacement Pavilion at North Walls, 21 September 2016 refers).
- 10.4 It had been hoped – based on informal third party advice - that costs for the Pavilion Project scheme could be reduced quite significantly from the original estimate of £600,000, given that the Town Account allocation for the project was £300,000. However, the latest, detailed costings commissioned by the Council from an external cost consultancy have estimated to the figure for delivery of the scheme at £800,000. This figure was received at the time of writing this report and it has not been possible to discuss it further with The Pavilion Project nor AR Design, nor scrutinised by Sport Clubhouses, the technical experts who have been working with The Pavilion Projects on costings. This needs to be done in order to gain a shared understanding of costs and of opportunities that remain to ‘value engineer’ the scheme to an affordable level.
- 10.5 Fundraising for the community-led design has been more challenging than had been hoped, although the Sport England grant assessors have been encouraging in their response to an application submitted by the Pavilion Project. Other potential funders have required planning consent to be in place before accepting an application and so the focus of the Project in recent weeks has been to draft the application. This is now ready to submit, although securing permission in no way commits Town Forum to delivering the scheme produced by AR Design.
- 10.6 As indicated in paragraph 2.8 above, an application has also been made to the Charities Commission for charitable status. This will open the door to other funding streams for which the Pavilion Project was previously not eligible.
- 10.7 All in all, the Pavilion Project team have put many hours of work into the development of the community-led proposals and enjoy a high level of support from those who have seen them.
- 10.8 It is recognised that an ongoing delay to the replacement of the pavilion is not desirable for the Council nor for users of the cricket pitches.
- 10.9 Officers from the Estates Team are still confident that an alternative design could be commissioned for the new facility which would have both lower

construction and maintenance costs, and which would in itself improve the very poor current provision. The design of the building could be simplified while maintaining an interesting external appearance. Whilst the design might not be as iconic as the Pavilion Project scheme, nor offer quite the same features or footprint, it would still require some additional funding from the Town Account: however. However, it would be more affordable and potentially easier to maintain and service.

10.10 It is assumed that the first of the three options ('like for like') set out at paragraph 2.1 is not desirable. Members are therefore asked to consider how they would like to proceed:

- a) To request the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) to commission a new design based on an agreed budget and specification, or
- b) To give further time to the Pavilion Project to apply for grants, 'value engineer' the AR Design scheme, design out the elements considered to be prone to vandalism and try to close the funding gap. Given the time taken to apply for funding, this would realistically need to be another 6 to 9 months. If the Project were to be unsuccessful, Estates could still commission and deliver a new design.

## 11 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

11.1 This report, and the preceding one in September 2016 ([WTF231](#) – Proposed Replacement Pavilion at North Walls, 21 September 2016) set out three options available to Members for the replacement pavilion.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:-

#### Previous Committee Reports:-

Minutes of meeting of Winchester Town Forum, 25 January 2017, [item 5](#)

[WTF231](#) – Proposed Replacement Pavilion at North Walls, 21 September 2016

[WTF235](#) Winchester Town Account Budget 2016/17, 18 November 2015

[WTF236](#) Winchester Town Account Budget 2016/17, 20 January 2016

[CAB2763](#) (Revised), Budget and Council Tax 2016/17, 18 February 2016

Other Background Documents: None

APPENDICES: None