

Subject:	King Alfred Development		
Date of Meeting:	11 July 2013		
Report of:	Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Mark Jago	Tel: 29-1106
	Email:	mark.jago@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Central Hove (directly) all others indirectly		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The council has been seeking to replace the outdated facilities in the King Alfred Leisure Centre (“KALC”) for many years. Formulation of the Indoor Sports Facilities Plan 2012-22, reaffirmed the need to replace the KALC and gave fresh impetus to review the project and the development opportunities it presents; something that has the potential to deliver significant improvement in sports provision with attendant revenue savings, as part of a mixed enabling development.
- 1.2 Significant progress has been made during the past 8 months; work that has been overseen by a new cross-party Project Board. The report advises Members of the key strands of work that have been completed and which have enabled the Board to reach agreement on the city council’s aspirations for both the facilities required in the new sports centre, and the type of enabling development necessary to support its delivery. The Project Board has sought to explore the opportunities for delivering a high quality development which is both affordable and deliverable. The work of the Project Board means that the council is now in a well-informed position to test the market and can better respond to developer interest. This report therefore seeks support for the work undertaken to date and approval to take the project forward to the next stage, most notably the process by which to procure a preferred developer.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Policy & Resources Committee:

- 2.1 Note and thank the Project Board for the work undertaken to date, the main findings of which are summarised in Sections 3.9 to 3.44 of this report, and support the Project Board’s recommendations to proceed.
- 2.2 Support the Board’s view that the project’s primary objective remains the delivery of a new, modern sports facility in the west of the city, either on the King Alfred site or another appropriate site to be identified as part of the procurement process by a preferred developer.

- 2.3 Agree that the proposed sports centre specification shown at Appendix 1 provides the appropriate range and mix of facilities demanded in the city, and approve the specification as the basis for taking the project forward.
- 2.4 Note the forecast revenue costs for the proposed sports centre, the potential saving this provides when compared with the costs to the council of the current centre, and the potential this has to support council borrowing to enable direct investment towards the capital cost of the new facility.
- 2.5 Note the findings of the development viability advice, which suggests financially viable solutions are possible, but that pragmatic compromises are likely to be required.
- 2.6 Agree the appointment of appropriate external advisers to support the procurement and evaluation process and approve the allocation of existing financial resources to enable this.
- 2.7 Agree that the Council should seek a preferred developer for the sports centre and enabling development by way of the Competitive Dialogue process and note the indicative programme leading to this, including a proposal for an open day with potential developers, and that a further report leading to the appointment of a preferred developer will return to a future meeting of this committee.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 There have been a number of attempts to bring about the redevelopment of the KALC, with the most recent being the Karis ING scheme, on which work began in 2001. Having been appointed as preferred developer in 2003, and securing planning consent in 2007, that scheme was ultimately unable to proceed.
- 3.2 Following the termination of the Karis ING redevelopment project in November 2008, the council has undertaken essential health & safety work to the existing sports centre to allow its continued operation for the foreseeable future. Despite these works and other improvements the centre fails to meet modern expectations, is expensive to operate and maintain and due to the age of the building it is impossible to predict the life-span of the existing facility. It is recognised that a long term replacement for improved, modern and extended facilities is essential to serve the west of the city.

Indoor Sports Facilities Plan 2012-22

- 3.3 The citywide Indoor Sports Facilities Plan, approved by Cabinet in April 2012, further emphasised the need to replace the King Alfred Leisure Centre, with the main findings of the plan as follows:
 - Sports stakeholders, clubs and users all believe the city needs a new flagship centre
 - Swimming pool provision is not sufficient
 - There is not enough sports hall space and no major sports hall

- There is still room for growth and excess demand for health and fitness activities
- Geographical distribution of facilities in the city is uneven
- Artificial grass pitch provision does not meet demand
- There are demands for specialist sports facilities in the city, including a gymnastics centre
- There is strong recognition that as well as the demand for an expansion of facility provision, existing facilities also need to be improved and there would be a significant funding requirement over the next ten years to enable these to remain fit for purpose.

3.4 In addition, the Plan recognised the importance of replacing the existing KALC facility, and a number of options were identified as below. There are considerable economies of scale from locating all of the facilities for a new sports centre on one site, but other options were identified if this was not possible.

- Replace the existing KALC with a large wet/dry centre on the existing site similar in scope to the previous scheme
- As above, but with a smaller centre on the King Alfred site and locate some facilities elsewhere
- Locate a new centre elsewhere and cease to provide facilities on the King Alfred site
- Locate a new centre elsewhere and retain a smaller centre on the King Alfred site as a local community facility

3.5 As part of the April 2012 Cabinet report it was agreed that a new Project Team should be established to begin scoping work on options for the future of the KALC. That work, which began in the summer of 2012, included the creation of a new Project Board.

Project Board

3.6 The King Alfred Project Board comprises Councillor Bowden (Chair), Councillor Wealls, Councillor Morgan, and Tony Mernagh of the Economic Partnership. The Board held its inaugural meeting on 27 November 2012. At this meeting the Board considered the primary drivers for the project, critically the need for a replacement centre, something evidenced by the Indoor Sports Facilities Plan, and considered this alongside the site's history and planning context. The following project objectives were agreed in response:

- To secure the long-term replacement of the outdated sports facilities currently on offer at the King Alfred Leisure Centre.
- To oversee delivery of modern and extended sport and leisure facilities in the west of the city.
- To consider options for the wider regeneration of the King Alfred site which incorporates the sport and leisure facilities on site (or alternative location in the west of the city) within a high quality mixed development which enhances the seafront and surrounding area.
- To achieve a development which is cost neutral to the Council in capital terms, which is sustainable in revenue terms and which provides affordable and accessible public sports and leisure facilities.

- 3.7 In initiating the new project, the Board emphasised the importance of learning lessons from the previous development process and agreed that the council should be “aspirational” in seeking the best possible facilities in the new sports centre, a centre that must meet the city’s demands and expectations. The Board therefore agreed a range of workstreams, central to which, and as a starting point, was a review of the sports centre specification.
- 3.8 The Board has met on 4 occasions during the past 8 months, has overseen considerable progress and achieved a broad consensus on the aspirations for this major development, together with an understanding of the challenges this brings. A summary of the key areas of work is set out in the following sections.

Sports Centre Base Needs Review / Specification for New Wet/Dry Sports Centre

- 3.9 In 2010, officers undertook preparatory work to help inform any subsequent King Alfred Development project. This included a comprehensive review, undertaken by Ken Burlton Consultancy, a specialist sport and leisure consultant, of the original sports needs analysis, brief and specification, alongside the then current status of sports provision in Brighton and Hove. This review took into account:
- Lessons from the development process
 - General developments in Sports Provision since 2002
 - Changes in the Brighton & Hove Sports Facility Profile 2002 to 2010
 - Other sports facility developments in the region since 2002
 - Sports Facilities Audit 2008
- 3.10 The review resulted in recommendations on what an ‘optimum’ brief should include and on the ‘minimum’ level of provision that would be required in any new sports centre; a level below which it would call into question the value of the development in terms of sports provision.
- 3.11 In line with the Board’s desire that the city should be as aspirational as possible, a further review of the sports needs analysis has since been completed. Although the earlier review was concluded three years ago, the subsequent preparation of the Indoor Sport Facilities Plan (see 3.2 above), and the consultation that was undertaken as part of this, served to confirm that the earlier work remains valid and that it is regarded as having the potential to substantially improve provision in the west of the city. Some revisions were however proposed and the further analysis resulted in what is now referred to as a ‘maximum’ specification, details of which are shown in Appendix 1. This was presented to the Board in January 2013 and alternative types of provision were also debated. For example, the Project Board concluded that a 50m swimming pool would not be best suited to the needs of the city.
- 3.12 A key focus of a new King Alfred Sports Centre is to increase participation in sport and physical activity including swimming. It is therefore proposed to provide a 25m pool, a large teaching pool (both with moveable floors) and a leisure pool as these provide a far greater flexibility of use than a 50m pool (even if the latter is sub-divided).

- 3.13 Where 50m pools have been built, they are rarely used in the full 50m configuration other than early mornings for elite swimmers and for occasional competitions. This is the case at the 50m pool built in recent years at Crawley. Furthermore, the Crawley pool has the advantage of attracting competitions with its more central regional location and the considerable car parking provision that is required for large events.
- 3.14 The proposed pools configuration of 25m, teaching and leisure pools is viewed as providing a much better balance between community and competitive use for a new sports centre in the city. This is supported by Sport England who recognise the advantage of a stand alone teaching pool in the provision of swimming lessons, and for other groups which benefit from a separated pool space e.g. faith swimming lessons. Furthermore, it would be possible to have differential water temperatures between the 25m pool, teaching pool and leisure pool with would be appropriate for the different types of use i.e. the water temperature would be higher in the teaching and leisure pools.
- 3.15 The Board agreed the 'maximum' specification as the basis for moving forward and this has been factored into the sports centre floor area requirements and financial analysis summarised below.

Floor Area Requirements

- 3.16 Analysis of the floor area requirements associated with the facilities set out in the 'maximum' specification suggests that the total floor area of the sports centre building would increase to around 18,000 m². This is an increase of 1,200 m² from the 'optimum' specification of 16,800 m². These figures include allowances for car parking provision.
- 3.17 It is important to note that the estimated floor space has been based on generic floor areas and not on any specific scheme. Floor areas will therefore vary as specific proposals are worked up and as the scheme progresses to final design.
- 3.18 No further enhancements have been made to ancillary and support facilities, such as changing and car parking, to take account of increased throughput. At this stage of development, provisions made in the 'optimum' specification are still considered to be adequate. Therefore the estimated additional floor space for activity areas only has been identified.

Build Costs

- 3.19 As part of the work undertaken in 2010, cost consultants were appointed to provide estimates for building a new sports centre on the existing site based on the identified minimum and optimum specifications. Their report put the total cost of the minimum specification at approximately £28.5m, with the optimum specification rising to around £35m.
- 3.20 Applying that earlier work to the spatial requirements of the 'maximum' specification, plus an allowance for build cost inflation since that time, would put the estimated cost at around £40m.

- 3.21 Again, it is important to note that the above costs are based on generic floor areas and a range of assumptions, not on any specific scheme. Costs will therefore vary according to site specific factors, configuration, and final design. For example, a significant cost (c£7m) within the current total relates to the provision of basement car parking on the existing site. A different solution would have a significant impact e.g. surface car parking would involve significantly lower costs. The costs are however considered to provide a sufficient basis on which to move forward.
- 3.22 The estimated build costs do not include full fitting out of the facility including gym, sports and office equipment. It is assumed that these items would be provided by an external operator. In addition, the following costs are also excluded:
- VAT
 - Contamination remediation
 - Legal fees
 - Land costs
 - Temporary phasing costs such as keeping the existing centre open during reconstruction (not possible for the previous Karis/ING scheme) or providing alternative facilities elsewhere
 - Council project management costs
 - Enabling finance costs

Revenue Costs

- 3.23 The size, age and condition of the existing KALC make it a very expensive facility to operate. At present it costs the council approximately £700,000 a year. Replacement with a modern, well designed and more sustainable sports centre which attracts more users will significantly reduce revenue costs to the council.
- 3.24 The estimated saving to the council of a new sports centre to the 'maximum' specification, in comparison with the existing facility, is approximately £730,000 per year, as it is anticipated the new facility could be operated with a small payment to the council.
- 3.25 On this basis, delivery of the 'maximum' specification sports centre could deliver significant savings that could be used to support borrowing. This would allow the council to make direct capital investment in the new sports centre, thus reducing the financial pressure on the enabling development.

Sports Centre - Site Location

- 3.26 The current Leisure Centre occupies a 1.7 hectare seafront site known to have considerable development potential. As stated earlier in this report, among the options referred to in relation to the KALC in the Indoor Sports Facilities Plan, was the possibility of locating the new centre elsewhere. This obvious potential development value afforded by the site's seafront location, and emerging planning policy provides for a continued basis for residential development on the site, there is the implicit suggestion of scope to explore a development package

that provides replacement sports facilities on an alternative site. It is however acknowledged that such an approach would need careful consideration.

3.27 Provision on an alternative site offers significant potential advantages. The main advantages are considered to be:

- 1) the potential for uninterrupted service (i.e. replacement facilities built prior to closure of existing – subject to funding/phasing arrangements). If replaced on the existing site, for the build period of 2-3 years the city would be without its largest sports facility and would provide significantly less opportunities for residents to participate in sport and physical activity. The recently published citywide Indoor Sports Facilities Plan concluded that the existing provision across the whole city (including the KALC) is not meeting the needs of residents. Closing the KALC even for a temporary period would therefore mean this position would be worsened even further.
- 2) the entire KA site would become available for higher value uses (increased housing provision), thus generating value to meet the cost of the replacement facilities.
- 3) the new centre would benefit from a 360 degree catchment area, potentially improving access and thereby increasing usage and revenue generation.
- 4) an alternative location may benefit from better public transport links.
- 5) If an alternative site was large enough to enable ground level as opposed to basement car parking, the cost of a new sports centre could be c£7m less than a facility on the current site.

3.28 The 'site search' undertaken as part of the previous project concluded that, whilst other sites existed, none at that time were viable, due to various constraints, or which were beyond the control of the council and thus involved greater risk and uncertainty.

3.29 The earlier site search has been reviewed and updated, the findings of which were reported to the Board in April 2013. The Board noted the existence of possible alternative sites, some of which are in council ownership and others privately owned.

3.30 The Board was however mindful of the fact that the project is in its early stages, and that there could conceivably be other sites that emerge as part of the procurement process and as the more detailed design and delivery arrangements are explored. The Board therefore concluded that it need not rule out options at this point, particularly since the objective is to deliver replacement facilities in the west of the city, and in recognition of the initial financial analysis and the challenges this presents.

3.31 It is therefore proposed that the tendering information should specify that the new sports centre must be in the west of the city, and this should be accompanied by the clear identification of the geographic area within which this should be. In this

way, developers will be able to review options and potentially come forward with proposals for on-site and off-site provision.

Site Valuation/Development Appraisal

- 3.32 Following the Board's agreement to the updated 'maximum' specification (and its consideration of the spatial and cost implications involved), development appraisal and valuation advice was commissioned in March 2013. The main purpose of this advice is to aid understanding of the potential value that could be generated from the enabling development in order to help fund the new sports centre. This is clearly critical to understanding overall financial viability and thus the realism of achieving the desired sports centre.
- 3.33 The development appraisal work considered two main options, with a range of sensitivities within each then tested. It is important to recognise that this was undertaken at a necessarily high-level and fairly modest changes to the many assumptions have the potential to have a significant impact on the results. As the project advances, with greater detail on actual schemes emerging, very different results could be seen. The two main options are:
- 1) Construction of new sports centre on existing King Alfred site (on-site) alongside enabling housing development.
 - 2) The current site freed up for wholly residential development (accepting this will ultimately also include complementary uses such as café's) with the sports centre built on an alternative, as yet unidentified site (off-site).

On-site

- 3.34 This option assumes construction of the new 'maximum' specification sports centre with a total floor area of 18,000 sqm and costing approximately £40m. For the purposes of this task it was agreed that it would be based on a two-storey building above basement parking. This is an important consideration since the smaller area of land needed for the sports centre, the larger the area of land for enabling development and thus value creation.
- 3.35 With a total site area of 17,000 sqm, this results in a building footprint of around 7,500 sqm, leaving approximately 9,500 sqm for enabling housing use. Although there is basis for this configuration, as it resulted from earlier site capacity work, final configuration is very much dependent on the agreed scheme i.e. comprehensive development and detailed design, and a different layout is therefore possible.
- 3.36 The development appraisal considered a range of scenarios based on the volume and scale of housing development needed to create sufficient value to meet the construction cost of the sports centre. Sensitivity testing of the levels of affordable housing included (40% to 0%) and revised development site coverage was then undertaken.

Off-site

- 3.37 Wholly residential development to meet current policy requirements. This scenario tested what scale of development might be needed in order to generate the value required to meet the cost of delivering the 'maximum' specification sports centre on an alternative site i.e. generating a capital receipt for the council to build the new centre.
- 3.38 As with the on-site option, differing levels of affordable housing (40% to 0%) and site coverage were again tested.
- 3.39 The results of this work were presented to the Board on 15 May 2013. The Board noted that the results suggested there are potentially financially viable schemes within both options, but that they also present challenges and all involve a significant volume of housing development. The Board also acknowledged the need to consider the issue of potential overdevelopment and was mindful of the infrastructure challenges presented by a significant volume of housing units. The viability work also confirmed the range of variables that have a direct bearing on viability and which require further consideration as the scheme advances. For example, (i) acceptable scale and height of development, (ii) the final configuration of the sport centre, (iii) more storeys or the potential to build above it, (iv) alternative sites for the sports centre, (v) affordable housing provision, (vi) developer profit margins, and (vi) the potential for direct council investment in order to reduce the pressure on enabling development.
- 3.40 Having considered the financial viability work and the challenges this highlights, the Board agreed the priority should be to achieve the best possible sports centre, certainly not less than the optimum specification, with the best housing provision. The Board also recognised the need for realism and flexibility in terms of site location and percentage of affordable housing. There could be an option for the council to procure affordable housing at discount for general needs housing and specialist accommodation such as extra care housing to support delivery of the medium term financial strategy and address other council budget pressures.

Procurement

- 3.41 In procuring a development partner for the scheme, the council will be seeking to meet the objectives set out in this report, including securing a modern high quality sports centre, a design which minimises cost in use, the highest possible quality design for both the sports centre and the enabling development and a range of complementary uses.
- 3.42 The previous scheme was procured through a design and finance competition, with a very detailed brief and specification issued to developers. It was also procured through a full OJEU process, using the negotiation procedure, which unfortunately is no longer an available option. A summary of the previous process is shown at Appendix 2.
- 3.43 The most appropriate current procurement options are considered to be; 1) use of a Framework Agreement or 2) Competitive Dialogue. The former would involve use of an established framework with a prequalified list of providers with

agreed rates including terms and conditions. The latter, involves a 3 stage process that enables a degree of flexibility and engagement with the market in the development of solutions and specifications.

- 3.44 Having considered the options, the Board concluded that use of a framework, while offering a quicker route to market, would be too restrictive for a project of this nature and that Competitive Dialogue, although a more resource intensive and lengthy process, offered advantages, as it enabled engagement with a range of potential bidders, through which more attractive and competitive proposals could emerge.

Consultants/External Advisers

- 3.45 The King Alfred redevelopment is among the most significant projects in the city, the complexity of which, as with the earlier schemes, means the council will require appropriate specialist advice from external advisers. This support, which will be essential if the 'Competitive Dialogue' process is to be managed successfully, will be required almost immediately to assist with the production of tender information and as part of the team that will lead the procurement and evaluation exercise.
- 3.46 This is consistent with the arrangements on similar council projects. The cost of this support will be met from existing earmarked resources.

Timetable

- 3.47 Subject to agreement to the recommendations set out in this report, an indicative timetable for the next stages and procurement process is as follows:

Event	Timescale
1. Consultant briefs prepared (to support tender pack preparation)	July 2013
2. Tender for consultant support	July/Aug 2013
3. Consultant(s) appointed	Aug/Sept 2013
4. Prior Information Notice (PIN) issued and open day with potential developers	Oct 2013
5. Tender pack compiled	3- 6 months [Oct 2013 – Jan 2014]
6. Competitive Dialogue Process leading to appointment of Preferred Developer	further 12-18 months [Oct 2014 earliest – July 2015]
7. Planning application made	further 6 -12 months [April 2015 earliest – July 2016]
8. Development commences	further 2 years [April 2017 earliest - July 2018]

- 3.48 If the council was to appoint via a framework a Preferred Developer could be appointed inside 6 months and the process for getting to stage 3 and beyond would need to be agreed as part of the process.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 An extensive consultation exercise was undertaken between December 2011 and February 2012 to inform the Indoor Sports Facilities Plan. The surveys undertaken as part of this were designed to provide feedback regarding the quality of existing facilities and asked respondents to outline their priorities for any future development of sports facilities. In addition to which, specific surveys were sent to sports clubs listed on the council's Active For Life database. The headline findings and key information relating to the KALC are shown earlier in this report.
- 4.2 Consultation will form a vitally important element of the project's progression, particularly once a preferred developer has been appointed and the scheme begins to take shape.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1.1 The project objective (para 3.6) is to achieve a development which is cost neutral to the Council in capital terms, which is sustainable in revenue returns and which provides affordable and accessible public sports and leisure facilities.
- 5.1.2 The project support costs and the appointment of appropriate external advisors during the procurement and evaluation process can be funded from the Strategic Investment Fund and the King Alfred reserve.
- 5.1.3 The estimated cost for building a new sports centre to the maximum specification on the existing site is around £40m which could mainly be funded through enabling development. In order to fund an offsite sports centre option an enabling residential development scheme would be required to generate a capital receipt.
- 5.1.4 As set out in the report (para 3.19) the current council contribution towards the running costs of the sports centre are £700k per annum. The centre is managed under contract. Financial modelling shows the revenue costs and potential income streams for a new sports centre to be significantly improved with an estimated saving of £730k per annum compared with current costs (set out in para 3.19). There is potential to generate a capital contribution towards a new scheme.
- 5.1.5 The financial risks and any required contribution towards the development costs from the Council will need to be factored in to the Medium Term Financial Strategy and future budget strategies.
- 5.1.6 All site related costs and income which would be impacted by development including the car park, and lease arrangements will need to be factored into the evaluation process.
- 5.1.7 Detailed financial implications will be provided to support the next stage when detailed options are available.

Finance Officer Consulted: Anne Silley

Date: 20/06/13

Legal Implications:

- 5.2.1 The main legal implications concern the procurement options. As indicated at paragraph 3.42, these are either appointment of a Developer off an appropriate framework or appointment of a Preferred Developer by way of Competitive Dialogue. With Competitive Dialogue, the tender exercise would seek the construction of new leisure facilities in the west of the city in accordance with the agreed specification to be funded by (a) the value of enabling development to be retained or sold by the Preferred Developer and (b) funding from the council, based on running costs savings. It would not be necessary to stipulate the site of the new leisure facilities, but a plan would need to be provided to indicate the area within which they could be sited.
- 5.2.2 Once constructed, if the council secure an interest in the new leisure facilities, it will have the option of running the service in-house or going to the market, as occurs with other leisure facilities in the city (currently run by Freedom Leisure).
- 5.2.3 If the committee wish to decide in advance of the procurement exercise that the potential sites for the leisure facilities should exclude the King Alfred site, the quickest way to achieve a capital receipt would be to initially avoid the application of the EU Procurement Rules and propose to enter into a bona fide land deal for the sale of that site and then to separately procure the construction of the new facilities by Competitive Dialogue. A successful outcome to such a tender exercise would provide the council with a cost envelope for the new leisure facilities, but would not necessarily yield an appropriate site. Due to the limited availability of appropriate sites, the full blown EU procurement leading to Competitive Dialogue is therefore considered the most appropriate way forward.
- 5.2.4 By using Competitive Dialogue it would be open to the Council to secure positive development obligations on the enabling development as well as the new leisure facilities. As part of the outstanding pre-procurement work members therefore need to decide the extent to which the council as owner of the site should be prescriptive, directive or permissive and what input they wish to for example have on the design development process for both the enabling development and the new facilities. The council as local planning authority will have some control via the necessary planning application(s), but s106 Agreements rarely contain positive obligations to develop and there are new statutory provisions regarding developers being able to seek modification or release of affordable housing requirements.
- 5.2.5 Competitive Dialogue is a lengthy and expensive process. Paragraph 3.44 of this report sets out an indicative timetable. The first step is the issue of a Prior Information Notice which would facilitate the holding of an open meeting with potential developers and my assist with the subsequent full procurement process. A similar type of meeting was used in the previous process, but after the issue of the OJEU Notice. The tender pack needs to have sufficient information to ensure that competitive expressions of interests are forthcoming. Experience has shown that giving minimalist information does not speed the procurement process up, although it is accepted that a lighter touch approach on some aspects of the Development Agreement may facilitate quicker on site development. Appendix 2 indicates the previous process used, including the

extent of significant resource allocation and consultation. The negotiation procedure used in the previous exercise is no longer available, but much of the Competitive Dialogue process is similar.

Lawyer Consulted:

Bob Bruce

Date: 26/06/13

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 There are no specific equalities implications arising from this report, but the provision of sports facilities that are accessible to all sections of the community are important to increase participation and subsequently improve health and well-being.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 The current KALC has benefitted from investment in energy saving measures, however it is a very old facility and costly to run. Development of a new sports centre will address this as the appointed developer will be required to meet the council's objectives around sustainable development in relation to policies within the Submission City Plan.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 Increasing participation in sport and physical activity is recognised as having a positive effect on reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 Issues connected with risk and opportunities have formed part of the Project Board's discussions throughout this preparatory phase. This will be formalised as the project moves towards the next stage and a comprehensive Risk and Opportunity Matrix is envisaged.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.7 Regular participation in sport and physical activity is recognised as a very important means of improving the health of the local population, and reducing health inequalities. The provision of a new sports centre would increase participation and have a significantly positive impact on achieving these outcomes.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 Provision of improved sports facilities in a modern sports centre will help increase participation in sport and physical activity and widen access to help meet the outcomes of the council's Sport and Physical Activity Strategy.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 A series of options have been considered as part of the Project Board's preparatory work leading to this report.

6.2 A long term replacement for improved, modern and extended sports facilities is essential, and failure to do so could result in closure of the current building in the not too distant future. The age and configuration of the existing building means it is impossible to refurbish the facility to an acceptable modern day standard. The investment in the existing facility can only be considered to be keeping the existing centre open for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the only option is to redevelop the existing site to provide a new sports centre.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Redevelopment of the King Alfred Leisure Centre, the city's largest indoor sports facility, has been a priority for many years. Continuation of existing facilities in this rapidly aging building is becoming increasingly difficult and costly, a position that puts even greater pressure on the need for redevelopment.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Sports Centre Specification
2. Summary of key dates from previous procurement process.

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Indoor Sports Facilities Plan 2012-22