



Executive
16th April 2007

**Report from the Director of
Children and Families**

For Action

Wards Affected:
ALL

**Children's Centre Capital Programme
– Phase 2 Alternative Site Options and Phase 1 Update**

Forward Plan Ref: C&F-06/07-026

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 At its meetings of July 2006, November 2006 and February 2007, the Executive approved project proposals and associated capital allocations from the block grant for each of the projects in the Phase 2 Children's Centre Capital Programme. As further detailed work on those projects has progressed, it has become necessary to return to the Executive with an up-to-date report in respect of decisions needed to deliver the programme within time and on budget. No decision is being sought on providing additional capital resources for the phase 2 capital programme. This report seeks further decisions from Members in respect of the proposed Children's Centres in the Alperton area and at Wembley and Willesden Centres for Health and Care.
- 1.2 This report reviews the risks attached to the whole phase 2 capital programme. However the report acknowledges that there are no Council capital resources able to be re-directed to fund any gap-finance in the phase 2 Children's Centres. This report confirms that officers will seek reductions in the scope of the specification of new build and refurbishment projects so as to contain costs within the resources available from external funding (Sure Start grant). Whilst this report focuses on the development of infrastructure for Phase 2 Children's Centres, work is progressing well with partners to enable centres to deliver meaningful, appropriate and relevant services to local people.
- 1.3 It also considers the potential future transfer of the Harmony and Granville Children's Centres to the direct management of the Council.

2.0 Recommendations

The Executive is recommended:

2.1 In respect of the Alperton area, to:

Note that further feasibility work will be undertaken on the siting of the Children's Centre in Alperton either at Alperton Community School, Lyon Park Infant and Junior Schools or at Douglas Avenue Resource Centre. A further recommendation will be made to the Executive in May with a firm recommendation for one of these sites (see paragraphs 3.1 -3.4).

2.2 In respect of the PCT sites to:

Authorise the Director of Children and Families to approve the arrangements for the establishment of Children's Centres at Wembley and Willesden Centres for Health and Care as described in paragraph 3.5 and 3.6 and to sign a renewable 3-year licence agreement with the PCT with nil rental costs.

2.3 Note and approve the work being undertaken with the PCT in respect of the potential future transfer of Harmony and Granville Plus Children's Centres (see paragraph 3.7- 3.10 for details).

2.4 Note the overall position of the capital programme in terms of both time and budget and endorse the actions being undertaken to secure and improve this position (see paragraphs 3.11 – 3.10 for details).

3.0 Detail

Children's Centre serving the Alperton and Wembley Central Wards

3.1 In July 2006, the Executive agreed to the caretaker's house at Lyon Park Infant and Junior Schools (217 Mount Pleasant) being surplus to the school's requirements, to transfer the asset to the Children and Families Department service's requirements and thereafter to deploy it as a Children's Centre. Following that decision officers have progressed work both on the design and feasibility of the proposals and on the operational/service aspects of the centre regarding governance and management. Officers have worked with both Headteachers and a governor in developing the design, which is currently at a stage where it is almost ready to be submitted for Planning approval. In terms of the operational/service aspects of the centre, officers have attended meetings of the Governing Bodies of both the Infant and Junior Schools. These discussions have resulted in a decision from both Schools that they do not wish to govern the Children's Centre. This decision was based on the Schools' view that the catchment areas for the Children's Centre and schools were different and therefore not mutually beneficial. The Executive are advised that although the catchment areas are currently different, they are adjacent to each other. Whilst the Local Authority's preferred option would be for school governance, it is

feasible for a Children's Centre to operate on a school site and not be directly governed by the school governing body (particularly at Lyon Park where access would be gained not through school but from a public pavement). One model could be that a Children's Centre Management Board is established, with representation from the centre, service providers and community including parents. The Management Board could oversee the finances of the centre along with service outputs and include representation from both schools. This model would allow consistency of service provision across both schools and the centre whilst not adding any financial or other liability to either school. At the time of drafting this report, discussions are continuing with both schools along these lines and in terms of addressing concerns over catchment area.

3.2 The Lyon Park caretaker's house site is in an optimum location in relation to the catchment area for the Children's Centre in this locality (from the sites considered at the start of this project). This catchment area is adjacent to the catchment areas for the Infant and Junior schools. No additional childcare places will be developed, but family support, health and employability services will be located together on the site. Approximately 800 families with children aged under 5 will be served by the Centre. Children may attend nursery provision at Lyon Park Infant or other maintained schools, or at private, voluntary or independent nurseries in the locality. This site offers the opportunity to work closely with Infant and Junior schools, enhancing the benefits for those families with children aged 3-5 years old attending Foundation Stage (Nursery/Reception) at Lyon Park Infant School. Approximately 29% of the Lyon Park Foundation Stage live in the Children's Centre catchment area. Alternative sites considered, and already informally assessed are further away from residential areas within the priority Children's Centre catchment area and therefore not deemed to be as suitable as the site at Lyon Park schools. However, two additional sites are being considered; Alperton Community School and Douglas Avenue Resource Centre. Douglas Avenue has previously been considered and was presented to Members in an options paper in March 2006.

3.3 In November 2006, the Executive noted that an initial feasibility study indicated that remodelling work to the existing caretaker's house would provide the basis for good quality Children's Centre facilities and, in addition, that an extension to the existing school nursery would provide enhanced amenities for the maintained school provision (this included using land outside the caretaker's house site boundary between the nursery and house). As the initial feasibility studies looked mainly at the location of sites, and no agreement had been obtained from the Executive for the appointment of consultants at the early stages, the sufficiency and suitability of the space in the caretaker's house was not at that stage tested against DfES standards. Those initial proposals have now been tested through a more detailed feasibility study as part of the overall design development of the scheme. The design development options explored in the more detailed feasibility study included the refurbishment of the house with additional accommodation provided either through an extension or via a separate new build pavilion. It became clear that the best, most suitable and most cost effective option for the long term provision of services for children and families on this site is a separate standalone new build Children's Centre on the site of the former caretaker's house only achievable by the demolition of the house. It provides sufficient suitable accommodation within the boundaries of the caretaker's house site. If the demolition of the caretaker's house is not acceptable, the Children's

Centre could only be delivered at Lyon Park Schools if further (playing fields) land is taken from the schools either from the nursery or main school site; this is not feasible. An investment appraisal of the options was carried out, now included herewith as Appendix 1. The appraisal demonstrates that the demolition of the former caretaker's house has a higher initial capital outlay than the refurbishment options but is the only option which provides sufficient suitable accommodation for providing good quality Children's Centre services on the site and offers the most cost effective long term solution. Although this option is currently shown as being over budget, this was an initial cost estimate only and paragraphs 3.12 and 3.13 explain further how officers are working to bring this project back within budget. This option offers longer term and overall best value for the Council on this site, as evidenced in the investment appraisal.

- 3.4 Given that the more detailed design work has demonstrated that in order to develop a Children's Centre at Lyon Park Schools, the most cost effective option is the demolition of the caretaker's house and build of a Children's Centre on the same site, a number of alternative site options have been suggested which would avoid the need to demolish the existing caretaker's house. Alternative site options to Lyon Park Schools identified by Property and Asset Management, have been informally assessed. The sites are a combination of Council owned and other sites over which the Council is able to influence service outcomes. Two further alternatives of Alperton Community School (Ealing Road site) and Douglas Avenue Resource Centre are currently being further explored. Further detail on options, with a recommendation to develop an alternative will be presented to the Executive in May 2007. Based on initial positive discussions with the Headteacher, Alperton Community School presents a potential alternative solution to providing good quality Children's Centre facilities in this area. It is in an easily accessible location and sits alongside the Children's Centre catchment area. The Douglas Avenue Resource Centre is also being explored as a feasible alternative option, with officers considering potential alternative accommodation for existing staff teams. It was initially explored and reported to the Executive in an options paper in March 2006. This may now present an option that is more achievable within the timeframe and budget but needs to be considered further. It is also in a good location within the catchment area. Members should note that undertaking feasibility work on these alternatives sites in order to present a firm recommendation in May does carry some risk to both timescale and budget. Officers continue to manage those risks as part of an ongoing risk assessment process in order to either reduce the impact of the risk or eliminate it.

Wembley and Willesden Centres for Health and Care

- 3.5 In February 2007 the Executive resolved that if suitable and sufficient accommodation for Children's Centres at both Willesden and Wembley Centres for Health and Care could not be secured from the PCT by the end of February 2007 the development of alternative options at Treetops Nursery and Barham Primary School was approved.
- 3.6 By the end of February the PCT had confirmed their firm commitment to siting Children's Centres at Wembley and Willesden (with no rental costs) and legal agreements were being drawn up by the Council's lawyers. It is hoped that by the

time the Executive meets on 16th April the PCT's lawyers will have reviewed the agreements, which will be signed shortly afterwards. The Executive report last November indicated that the agreements (one for each site) would be 25-year lease agreements. This was due to the government's Sure Start Unit guidance stating that assets secured with capital funding should normally be secured for 25 years. However as the accommodation is being secured without the use of capital expenditure, the Sure Start Unit have agreed that the 3-year renewable licence agreement the PCT is proposing, is sufficient. It is not possible to enter into a lease for either site as there are no dedicated areas exclusively occupied by the Council Children's Centres; instead there is agreement for each Children's Centre to occupy certain rooms at each PCT premises for particular blocks of time during the week.

Harmony and Granville Plus Centre Transfer – Work with PCT

- 3.7 The development of phase 1 Children's Centres included the Sure Start South Kilburn and Sure Start Central Brent local programmes, now Granville Plus and Harmony Children's Centres. Both Sure Start local programmes were led by the PCT, funding was passed directly to the PCT by central government until April 2006, when Local Authorities were made accountable for all Children's Centre activities and all Children's Centre related grant became channelled through them. Since then the Council has been grant funding the PCT to run the Harmony and Granville Plus Centres. The amount of the grant has been the amount which had already been ring-fenced for these centres by central government. As the Council is now responsible for the use of that funding, officers have been monitoring Children's Centres' outputs at Granville Plus and Harmony. Arrangements were established with the PCT to ensure that grant monies were used for their intended purpose, and that the Council could be confident in the financial management processes used by the PCT.
- 3.8 The PCT felt that managing two Children's Centres delivering integrated early education and childcare, parenting, health and employability support was not PCT core business. Both PCT and Council officers believed that transferring the management of buildings and staff to the Council was in the best interests of families in the catchment areas, and would make the Council's role in administration much easier. Discussions about how to achieve this were commenced. However, a number of unresolved matters have prevented sufficient progress on the part of the PCT to enable officers to recommend transfer to date. Issues still preventing conclusion on these negotiations revolve around capital spend on the schemes, pension arrangements for the staff likely to be transferred to the employment of the Council as a result of the operation of the transfer of undertaking regulations and ensuring that the Council is protected from liabilities arising from the PCT's previous operation of the Centres. However, there has been a recent acceleration in PCT activity to resolve TUPE transfer, governance and capital overspend issues, and it is anticipated that a report will be provided for the Executive in summer 2007 requesting a decision on the transfer of both centres.
- 3.9 The discussions about transfer are continuing and in the interim the Director of Children and Families considers the service continuity must be maintained and that therefore staffing and building management will continue to be commissioned from the PCT. For the financial year 2007/8 it is proposed that

these arrangements be covered by a formal grant agreement or contract to ensure that the outputs that are a condition of the Sure Start grant funding received by the Council are achieved.

- 3.10 A report will be presented to Executive once there are sufficient details to make a recommendation. It anticipated that this report will be presented in the Summer 2007.

Overall Capital Programme

- 3.11 Since reporting to the Executive in July 2006 work has been done that provides an increasingly clearer picture on the ability of the Council to deliver seven Children's Centres within budget by the deadline of March 2008. A summary risk assessment table is provided as Appendix 2.

- 3.12 Initial cost estimates (based on more detailed specification) for the first three capital schemes have been returned recently and indicate higher costs than the initial budget allocations made to each scheme. Officers are not continuing to develop these schemes to the cost estimates provided but are working successfully with consultants to reduce this overall project cost to within the budget available. The main reasons for cost estimates currently being over the reported allocation are:

- These first cost estimates are based on work by consultants up to RIBA Stage C, some of which was based on consultant's assumptions and therefore included provisional sums rather than detailed cost analysis. Officers are working closely with consultants to further develop the requirements and streamline the provision of accommodation and facilities as much as possible to meet the budget. Further cost estimates are currently being prepared; officers will have a much clearer picture of the budget position at that time and be able to continue to reduce specification as required to ensure the centres can be built within budget.
- Increase in accommodation - The amount of accommodation required has increased from the original development brief presented to the Executive in July 2006 in order to better to comply with DfES standards and in order to provide more functional accommodation. Approval was given in July for that brief to be adapted for each project, and as this has happened through working with consultants. It has become clear that in order to develop functional centres that will be well used, the space needed to be increased. This assessment was made partly based on knowledge of the extensive use of particular rooms within phase 1 centres. As was explained in the July 2006 Executive report, the core offer of services which must be delivered should be interpreted locally. Centres develop innovative ways of providing core services to local people including those delivered in partnership with a range of other service providers, both statutory and non statutory, for example Job Centre Plus. Centres should be developed with sustainability in mind and phase 2 centre buildings have been designed to maximise rental potential in evenings and weekends, and during the day where there are small gaps in the timetable. Additional space has however brought additional costs whilst at the same time rendering the new build or refurbishment more cost effective on a cost per m² basis. The proposed accommodation is not exceptionally

generous but space required in order to provide full Children's Centre services to 800 families, 10 hours a day for 48 weeks of the year. Officers do not currently believe there is scope for significantly reducing accommodation requirements on all schemes.

- The July 2006 budget allocations (with the exception of the scheme at Wembley Primary School) were indicative only and were not based on detailed cost estimate work, simply on an assessment of the site options and number of centres to be created within the budget.
- DfES guideline costs per m² are not reflective of the current local cost per m² of developing buildings of this size. In trying to "respect" cost guidelines project costs are often underestimated. Now commissioned, consultants provide increasing clarity on the direction of costs, space requirements and also ability to construct in time.

3.13 Members are not being asked to consider allocating Council capital resources for these projects. Particularly in light of lessons learnt from phase 1, officers will continue to manage all projects in order to provide centre buildings within the budget available. In order to address the budget position of the overall programme, the following steps are being taken which Members are asked to endorse in recommendation 2.5:

- Reducing each scheme specification and accommodation (where possible and appropriate) to reduce overall scheme cost. Currently schemes are designed to a specification similar to that of phase 1 centres (although the amount of accommodation is much reduced in phase 2). Officers have aimed to provide as much consistency across both phase 1 and phase 2 Children's Centre buildings as possible in order to give equal importance to all services, and the brief reflects that. There is scope to reduce this specification in order to provide more basic buildings and facilities whilst retaining the essential space required to deliver Children's Centre services. Officers felt it was important in this programme to aim as high as was reasonably expected could be afforded and if necessary, to reduce the scheme to ensure it could be afforded. The schemes are currently subject to further cost assessment. At which point, officers will have more information on the need and ability to reduce accommodation and specification further and to a much more basic level.
- Identifying and capitalising on any sources of additional grant funding that could be made available for some or all of these projects. Sure Start Sustainability Capital has already been identified, and further resources could potentially be made available. Officers are also working with the St Raphaels, Brentfield and Mitchellbrook Neighbourhood Renewal Project on securing Walking Links funding for external work at St Raphael's Community Centre (estimated at £40k). Officers are also exploring opportunities to use unspent Section 106 monies previously allocated for community resources in some areas. This is additional Section 106 money and will not impact on that already included in the Children and Families capital funding.
- Using under-spent Sure Start revenue grant funding to pay for elements of each capital project, (where legitimate) such as professional fees and furniture

and equipment, thus making more capital budget available for construction costs.

- Take up additional support and advice from the DfES and their technical consultants, NPS, on delivering these schemes within budget. There will be no additional cost for this support.
- Identifying any schemes where an alternative site option may be more cost effective, for example Lyon Park as detailed above and the PCT sites where alternative site options would be more expensive, also detailed above.
- Writing to the DfES to request additional capital for the overall programme (to increase specification again), explaining the particular circumstances faced in Brent surrounding the PCT and demonstrating our plans to deliver all seven schemes.

3.14 The programme and timeline continue to be under review. In order to ensure completion by March 2008 the following steps need to be taken:

- Generally, ensure that centres can be operationally designated as Children's Centres before the end of March 2008. Sure Start designation criteria are much more flexible than requiring a centre to be fully open and delivering all services to the public. By having suitable plans in place for service delivery, all centres will be designated by March 2008, thus ensuring that the Government target is reached and reducing the risk of clawback of funds.
- Generally, ensure that capital can be spent before the end of the financial year (07/08), even if the centre is not fit to allow members of the public to use the centre on that date. Currently, officers would expect all capital to be spent on all schemes but with risk attached to those at Lyon Park due to issues outlined in earlier paragraphs.
- Generally, adopt procurement methods that reduce construction time and compress the programme.
- Take up additional support and advice from the DfES and their technical consultants, NPS, on delivering these schemes on time. There will be no additional cost for this support.

3.15 Whilst officers will continue to work to secure and improve the position in respect of both time and budget, the worst case scenario should all risks materialise is that 7 centres cannot be delivered by March 2008 within the budget available. At this stage Members are asked to note that the worst case scenario could be that the quality and/or functionality of each centre is reduced. Officers will continually review the position as work progresses and details are finalised and report again to Members in the future for decisions on proposed solutions should they be required.

3.16 Members should also note that a decision to withdraw from the phase 2 Children's Centre programme at this stage on the basis of the risks attached to the capital programme would itself bring risks; financially, in terms of our ability to meet service targets and in reputation. In terms of financial commitments made

to date, the Council has incurred costs in developing this programme to this stage based on Executive approvals in March, July and November 2006 and also in February 2007. Costs incurred to date total £226,693. This amount could not be recovered from the Sure Start grant should the Local Authority withdraw from the programme. There is no current budget allocation that could be utilised to meet such costs; therefore reductions would be required elsewhere in the budgets. In addition, the two year revenue allocation granted to the Local Authority to sustain services in phase 1 centres and to develop phase 2 centres is likely to have to be returned to the Sure Start Unit proportionally (approximately 7/12^{ths} or £2,241,714 of the total allocation of £3,842,938). The DfES have re-iterated that the Childcare Act 2006 gave early years and childcare services a legal underpinning so that they can become permanent mainstream core LA functions. The new duties in the Act confirm Local Authorities' key role as strategic leaders for childcare and children's services. The Local Authority has also accepted the offer of the General Sure Start funding under the terms and conditions detailed in the Memorandum of Grant letter dated 11th April 2006, following Executive approval in March 2006. The DfES have also indicated that if a Local Authority has significant concerns about the Children's Centre programme and is considering withdrawing from it, they would work closely with the Local Authority (along with NPS) to work towards the delivery of the target number of centres within the current timescale and budget available (support as detailed above in paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14). If absolutely necessary, the Local Authority may be able to apply to the DfES to reduce the number of centres to be developed in this phase, but this has already been achieved once, at the start of the programme reducing the number of centres from 9 to 7, whilst still reaching the target number of children. Members are also asked to note that the Local Authority has already committed and incurred costs on providing a Children's Centre as part of the new Wembley Primary School building based on final Executive approval being given in November 2006. This capital funding has already been approved by Sure Start and as such the Council is committed to providing Children's Centre services in the building developed with that capital. Withdrawal from the programme at this stage would risk the Council's reputation with the DfES, with partner service providers and with local people. Members are also reminded that Brent's Corporate Strategy 2006-2010, Children and Young People's Plan and Local Area Agreement all refer to the expansion of the Children's Centre programme as a means of achieving the Council's targets on Early Excellence and giving children the best start in life.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 The total Children's Centres capital allocation for 06/07 and 07/08 (combined) is £2,049,714. In addition, an allocation of £360,000 has been made from the General Sure Start Grant (Extended Schools) capital funding to support the development of Children's Centres on school sites. The capital allocation is direct grant rather than supported borrowing and therefore in itself has no net impact on the Council Tax. Table 1 below shows how the capital allocations have been revised based on developments in the overall programme.

Table 1 – Summary of Capital Allocations – Latest revisions shown in column C

A	B	C	D	E
Project	Scope of Works	Revised CC Allocation (April 07)	CC Allocation (Jan 07)	CC Allocation (Nov 06)
Wembley Primary School	Facilities in new build primary school	374,000	374,000	374,000
Fryent Primary School	New build on former production kitchen site	450,000	450,000	450,000
Alperton Area	To be confirmed following feasibility studies	415,000	415,000	415,000
Heritage Family Centre with St Raphaels Community Centre	Refurbishment/remodelling of community centre	412,548	412,548	412,548
Willesden Centre for Health and Care	Use of existing accommodation, possible minor works/equipment purchase	100,000	0	100,000
Wembley Centre for Health and Care	Use of existing accommodation, possible minor works/equipment purchase	100,000	308,166	100,000
Queens Park Community School	New build Children's Centre	450,000	450,000	558,166
All projects	Contingency	108,166	0	0
TOTAL		2,409,714	2,409,714	2,409,714

4.2 Table 2 below shows the overall Sure Start Capital grant funding available to the Local Authority. The Sure Start Capital grant is to be used to support the delivery of the Government's Ten Year Strategy for Childcare, *Choice for parents: the best start for children*. Local Authorities are given flexibility to determine how this capital is most effectively spent. Sustainability Capital is one of three elements of the Sure Start Capital grant (detailed in table 2 below). In Brent, the majority of Sustainability Capital will be spent supporting individual childcare providers, however it is acknowledged that Children's Centre provision would best support the parents of children using Treetops Nursery and others living in that catchment area. An allocation of £500,000 has been made to Treetops from the 07/08 Sustainability Capital allocation. Some work will take place at Treetops even if the centre isn't developed as a full Children's Centre. This may not require the full budget allocation, therefore releasing some funds for other projects. Of the amounts below, all of the Children's Centre and Extended Schools elements are committed. The Sustainability Capital, aside from the allocation made for

Treetops detailed above, is generally held in reserve for childcare providers to apply for as and when need arises for individual projects.

Table 2 – Summary of All Sure Start Grant Capital Allocations

Grants	06/07 (£)	07/08 (£)
Children's Centres	676,406	1,373,308
Extended Schools	256,863	521,509
Sustainability Capital	446,741	907,019
TOTALS	1,380,010	2,801,836

4.3 As reported in July and November 2006, these capital projects bring with them liability for ongoing running costs. A revenue grant is confirmed up to March 2008, after which time no revenue grant funding is confirmed for the Local Authority, although this is the expectation. The risks associated with this were detailed in the July report. It is intended that a further report seeking approval of the full revenue expenditure profile will be submitted for Executive approval at a later date.

5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 Works and consultancy contracts in respect of the development of the Children's Centres will need to be procured in accordance with the requirements of the Council's standing orders and the EU Procurement Regulations where applicable.

5.2 A formal agreement will need to be entered into between the PCT and the Council in respect of the use of Willesden and Wembley Centres for Health and Care if the proposal to locate Children Centres there proceeds and this is currently being finalised.

5.3 As these are grant funded works there will be outputs upon which the grant is dependent and there is the possibility of claw-back of grant monies should projects fail to meet their specified outputs (this is detailed in paragraph 3.16).

5.4 The Council will need to enter into contracts and other arrangements with partners to commission services to deliver the Children's Centre services. Any such contracts and arrangements will need to be monitored to ensure that targets are met and best value is achieved.

5.5 In relation to Harmony and Granville Children's Centres, the Council's role as accountable body means that for financial year 2006/07 a grant arrangement was in place to enable the PCT to run services at the two centres. Outputs are being monitored. However until a decision is made on any future transfer of these centres to the Council, there needs to be an interim contract or grant agreement in place for the new financial year that clearly commits the PCT to delivering the outputs that are a condition of the Council's Sure Start grant from the Government.

6.0 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 Diversity implications were fully considered in the July report. At the time of that report, an Equality Impact Assessment was carried out. A copy is available from the office of the Director of Children and Families. It is expected that there will be a positive impact on equalities as a result of this capital programme.
- 6.2 Services offered will be tailored to meet the needs of local communities. The greatest resource for Children's Centres will go to those children most in need. Phase 2 Children's Centres cover the borough's 30% most disadvantaged super-output areas as measured by the National Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2004). The IMD 2004 measures seven domains of deprivation: income, employment, health and disability, education, skills and training, living environment and crime.
- 6.3 Each Children's Centre has a unique catchment area and community profile, some covering more advantaged areas where they link geographically to more disadvantaged ones. These areas are characterised by their diversity of culture, ethnicity and faith. Families living in all of these areas experience varying levels of disadvantage based on the indicators given above.
- 6.4 Children's Centres will benefit the whole community including those families considered hardest to reach. All centres will be inclusive and compliant with the access requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

- 7.1 There will be staffing/accommodation implications should the alternative option of Douglas Avenue be developed to provide the Children's Centre in the Lyon Park catchment area.

Background Papers

- i) Equality Impact Assessment – September 06
- ii) Report re. C&F06/07-001 – Children's Centres – Phase 2 Capital Programme (17th July 2006)
- iii) Report re. C&F06/07 011 Phase 2 Children's Centres – Capital Programme Approval (13th November 2006)
- iv) Report re. C&F06/07-021 Phase 2 Children's Centre Capital Programme (12th February 2007)
- v) Project files
- vi) Risk assessment table

Contact Officers

Nitin Parshotam, Head of Asset Management, Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley Middlesex HA9 7RW.

Tel: 020 8937 3061. Fax: 020 8937 3073

Email: nitin.parshotam@brent.gov.uk

Cheryl Painting, Children's Centre Capital Project Manager, Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley Middlesex HA9 7RW.

Tel: 020 8937 3227. Fax: 020 8937 3073
Email: cheryl.painting@brent.gov.uk

Director of Children & Families
John Christie

Lyon Park Children's Centre – Options/Investment Appraisal – February 2007

Option	Estimated Construction Cost (£)	Estimated Refresh Cost (£)	Estimated Total Cost (£)	Pros	Cons
1. Refurbishment of caretakers house only (138m ²)	186,300	135,000	321,300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains existing council asset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Does not provide sufficient suitable CC accommodation</i> Costs as much in cost/m² to refurbish this house as it would to build new Greater element of unknown cost in refurbishing building Believed to provide 25 yrs life but not guaranteed Delay in preparing alternative option
2. Refurbishment and extension of caretakers house	223,560 plus 250,000 new build extension Total = £436,300	36,000	509,560	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains and enhances council asset Provides some further accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Does not provide sufficient suitable CC accommodation</i> Existing house to meet Part L, bringing add. 20% costs. Not cost effective as smaller element of new build plus refurbishment costs Greater element of unknown cost in refurbishing building Believed to provide 25 yrs life but not guaranteed Delay in preparing alternative option
3. Refurbishment of caretakers house and adjacent new build pavilion	461,300	36,000	497,300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains and provides new council asset Provides further accommodation which could be more easily rented out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Does not provide sufficient suitable CC accommodation</i> Cost per m² unlikely to get Sure Start approval (not value for money) Not cost effective as smaller element of new build plus refurbishment costs Difficult to gain site access to construct Not feasible to fit on existing site Delay in preparing alternative option

4. Sell caretakers house and construct new CC in remaining site	588,000	36,000	624,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings capital receipt • Provides potential housing • Creates new council asset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not feasible to fit CC on remaining site</i> • Delay in preparing alternative option • Difficult to gain site access to construct
5. Preferred option – Demolish caretakers house and build new standalone CC (approx. 263m ²)	588,000	36,000	624,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides sufficient and suitable accommodation • Fits on site • Is independent of school yet has potential to work with school • Provides at least 25 year life • Most cost effective in terms over whole life cost • Creates new council asset, effectively worth more than estimated value of existing building • Schools preferred option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expensive option • Potential delay and additional cost if Executive require alternative sites options to be considered

Notes:

- These options are based on the assumption that the site is the boundary of the caretakers house and no additional site area is taken from the school and/or nursery.
- These costs are construction costs only and exclude fees, inflation, site issues or contingencies.
- Costs are currently higher than budget and are subject to review with consultants. Work completed to date shows this cost can be reduced.
- Any delay will compromise the programme possibly risking completion by March 2008.
- Initial survey of caretakers house is insufficient for the purposes of this appraisal.
- Estimated refresh costs and therefore total costs are over 25 years