

CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 1. | Leisure Services – Poult Wood Golf Centre – Maintenance Building | | |
| | 1. | Specification: | |
| | (i) | Purpose of the scheme | To address health and safety concerns relating to the existing building. The scheme provides an upgrade of the existing maintenance building for the operation of the grounds maintenance contract at PWGC, undertaken by Council staff. |
| | (ii) | Relevance to National/Council’s Strategic Objectives | (a) National: N/A. (b) Council: 7c – Operate the Council’s leisure facilities/services more effectively, efficiently and economically, within approved levels of resources, to meet identified needs; 7d – Improve health and safety at leisure facilities; and 18a – improve the fabric of our leisure facilities and access for all. |
| | (iii) | Targets for judging success | The scheme will be judged against; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved health and safety • Staff welfare |
| | 2. | <p>Description of Project / Design Issues: The maintenance building at PWGC was built in 1974 when the course opened and is of a reinforced concrete portal frame with blockwork and glazing infill panels. It was designed to serve the needs of staff and equipment maintaining the original 18 hole course.</p> <p>PWGC has been extremely successful and is recognised as one of the best maintained municipal pay and play golf facilities in the South East. The reputation of the facility has been enhanced by the opening of the 9 hole short course in 1994 and more recently a driving range facility.</p> <p>The maintenance building has been supplemented by additional steel container storage but the increased level of equipment desirable to maintain and improve the course maintenance and the age of the building have combined to result in inadequate and now, deteriorating accommodation.</p> | |

CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

A health and safety audit undertaken by the Council's Health & Safety Officer in 2007 identified a range of hazards as a consequence of the current accommodation. The conclusion of the report stated that; '*Serious concern was expressed following the inspection at the condition of these premises. The building is old, cramped and difficult to operate within. In addition the amount of equipment and materials stored in the premises presents a serious risk of trips, falls and manual handling injuries from moving items around to get to others*'. The body of the report included the statement that; '*Consideration should be given to the size of this unit and whether it is of adequate size for the amount of equipment now needing secure storage. The present layout may be improved by marking out clear bays and clear pedestrian routes through the building but I perceived that there is not enough room for this extensive operation*'. Further reference was made to the condition of the roof, ceilings and overall fabric of the building. A subsequent inspection revealed that windows, sills, gutters and walls are all in poor state of repair with leaks and some movement of walls.

Whilst straightforward repairs may be effected to ensure increased life of the building this would not address the space issues that prevail and therefore consultant architects have been employed to consider either refurbishment and extension of the existing building or demolition of the existing and replacement with a steel frame structure that, in either case, will provide sufficient secure storage, workshop, office and staff welfare facilities for the next 25 years.

The two options are outlined in more detail below;

Option One - Refurbishment/Extension – This option would include replacement of the external roof, windows and doors of the existing building, an internal 'soft' strip and replacement of suspended ceilings and fittings. One side wall of the existing building would be demolished and an extension of 65m² built from blockwork 1.2m high and steel cladding. The current welfare facilities would be enlarged and improved with the addition of showers. The total footprint of the finished building is estimated at 232m². The indicative budget cost of this option is £134,000.

Option Two – Demolition/Replacement – This option would include demolition of the existing building and replacement with a steel structure, clad with a single metal skin. Internal, insulated 'pods' would offer office and staff welfare facilities, similar to those described in Option One. The total footprint of the finished building is estimated at 216m². The indicative budget cost of this option is £130,500.

An Officer Study Group (OSG) has met the consultant architect and considered the two options. In both cases the indicative cost includes a design development allowance, preliminaries and a 5% contingency but does not include professional, building control or planning fees. The cost also does not include provision for alternative temporary accommodation for staff and equipment and 24 hour security that will be needed to safeguard the extensive range of machinery that is likely to be sited outdoors for the period of construction. Other omissions from the indicative budget cost include service installations such as CCTV, telephones and intruder alarms

CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>It is the advice of the consultant architect that the existing building is structurally sound and would be more resistant to intruders, machine impact and prevailing weather conditions. Conversely the proposed steel structure is lightweight and will only maintain ambient temperature internally, leaving it prone to condensation.</p> <p>At the meeting of the OSG consideration was given to reducing the cost of Option One through deletion of the improvements to the staff welfare facilities. The present facilities are cramped, in very poor condition and do not offer shower or drying room facilities. Whilst the OSG felt some improvements were inescapable, a decision not to install showers or increase the size of the facilities would represent a saving in the order of £20,000. The OSG concluded that this saving was undesirable in terms of staff welfare, however some savings have been achieved in liaison with the consultant architect and the Health and Safety Officer whose comments are shown below. These savings are reflected in the cost section below, with a revised building cost of £127,150.</p> |
| 3. | <p>Consultation: The OSG was constituted from officers from all relevant Services who comment as follows:</p> <p>The Facilities & Building Manager comments as follows: The original sheet roof covering was replaced in the late 1980s but has continued to be prone to leaks. The original concrete gutters and windows in the rear elevation have always been liable to movement as the building flexes due to ground conditions. This can cause leaks in the gutters and cracks in the windows. Maintenance expenditure from the Buildings Repairs Fund has always been targeted at these specific problems and keeping the building secure. Expenditure to improve/extend this building has always been outside the remit of BRREP.</p> <p>I therefore welcome this new scheme. My preference is in favour of Option One which, with appropriate replacement roof, gutters and windows, should address and overcome the problems outlined above and result in reduced routine maintenance expenditure over forthcoming years.</p> <p>The Senior Planning Officer comments as follows: The principle of either extension or replacement would be considered in largely the same way, having regard to adopted Green Belt policies within the Tonbridge & Malling Core Strategy. The main consideration is to maintain the openness of the Green Belt and therefore any new proposals will be considered having regard to any increase in floor area and bulk of the building when compared to the existing structure.</p> |

CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

In planning terms the works could be classed as essential infrastructure facilities for outdoor sports and recreation. Any extension or replacement should have no greater impact in terms of bulk, height, footprint etc than the existing. A supporting statement/justification would be needed outlining the requirement for the building in terms of health and safety issues. It was noted that the new build structure would be slightly smaller than the extended building but would be of greater height due to ridged roof.

Whilst there are no protected trees in the vicinity of the site, a tree survey will be needed indicating species and condition of any significant trees and the position of the works and access routes in relation to the trees. At this stage there do not appear to be any problems with the proposed development.

The Health and Safety Officer comments as follows:

Further to the Health and Safety Audit undertaken in 2007 and referred to in the description of the project, I am supportive of this scheme which should substantially address the outstanding issues. I am supportive of the improved welfare facilities for staff in line with the Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992 especially in light of the particular nature of the work undertaken by staff at this location. I believe the design of Option One offers improved opportunities for safe working practices related to maintenance undertaken by staff and safe practice in respect of vehicle movements and access. I would advise that approval is sought in liaison with the Fire Officer and Building Control Officers with regard to safe means of escape in the event of fire.

The Principal Accountant comments as follows:

Although this scheme was originally considered in January 2008 as a band C scheme (£51,000 to £100,000) the revised costings now received require this re-evaluation to be presented to Members. The funding for this scheme has been identified within the 'fast track budget' which will be reviewed during the 2008/09 year for presentation to Members in January 2009.

In addition to the consultation above, the greenkeeping staff at PWGC have been consulted on the proposals and are supportive of Option One.

CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

| 4. | <p>Capital Cost: An indicative cost plan has been provided for both options and is shown below;</p> <p>Option One - Building Costs £127,150 - Professional Fees at 17.5% £ 22,250 - Other fees £ 1,000 - Other services £ 22,500 - Total £173,000</p> <p>Option Two - Building Costs £130,500 - Professional Fees at 17.5% £ 22,850 - Other fees £ 1,000 - Other services £ 30,000 - Total £184,350</p> | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|--|--|--|
| 5. | <p>Profiling of Expenditure It is anticipated for the works to be undertaken during 2008/09 but depending on other works being undertaken at the Golf Course this may slip into 2009/10.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 855 752 890">2008/09 (£'000)</th> <th data-bbox="752 855 1200 890">2009/10 (£'000)</th> <th data-bbox="1200 855 1648 890">2010/11 (£'000)</th> <th data-bbox="1648 855 2092 890">2011/12 (£'000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 890 752 927">£173,000</td> <td data-bbox="752 890 1200 927"></td> <td data-bbox="1200 890 1648 927"></td> <td data-bbox="1648 890 2092 927"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | 2008/09 (£'000) | 2009/10 (£'000) | 2010/11 (£'000) | 2011/12 (£'000) | £173,000 | | | |
| 2008/09 (£'000) | 2009/10 (£'000) | 2010/11 (£'000) | 2011/12 (£'000) | | | | | | |
| £173,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | <p>Revenue Impact: Loss of investment income, calculated at 5% is £8,650pa.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| 7. | <p>Partnership Funding: None identified</p> | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | <p>Post Implementation Review: 12 months after completion.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | <p>Recommendation: Transfer to List A for implementation in 2008/09.</p> | | | | | | | | |