

STRATEGIC REVIEW OF SPORTS CENTRES IN BRENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Continuum Sport and Leisure Ltd were commissioned by the London Borough of Brent in June 2007, to undertake a strategic review of three of the borough's council owned sports centres, Charteris Sports Centre, Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre and Vale Farm Sports Centre. As stipulated by the Client Team at LB Brent Willesden Sports Centre was not subject to site specific or financial and design review due to its recent construction (2006) and successful operation to date. The impact of Willesden Sports Centre has however been considered within the borough-wide facility analysis. The centre's operational data has also been used as a comparator in relation to financial performance and usage figures of the other three centres.

In line with the objectives of the client brief, the review has focused on three centres as detailed above and determined a range of outline development options for all three sites. The opportunities identified and recommendations made within this review provide the London Borough of Brent with outline costs of providing modern, attractive, cost effective facilities which can better serve the leisure needs of local residents and increase participation levels over the next 10 – 15 years.

The development options proposed have arisen from a comprehensive research process which has incorporated strategic analysis of relevant policy, strategy and previous research documentation, consultation with key internal stakeholders, and both site specific and borough-wide facility analysis. Following financial review of the current operation of the three centres as well as the key planning issues (and policies) pertinent to development options under consideration, the research process culminated with a financial options appraisal providing outline capital cost implications for future options at all three sites.

The broad strategic review of relevant policy and guidance at national, regional and local levels highlights the potential of any positive change at all three centres to not only meet wider social objectives, but also to align with specific priorities of the Council's Sport Service and Planning Departments. The demographic profile and analysis of participation levels across the borough provide further evidence of the need for improved sports facility provision in or near to the existing sites (Stonebridge ward in particular) to help tackle major social issues such as poor

health, high incidence of crime and low educational attainment. The socio-economic status of Brent residents (particularly in the Stonebridge and South Kilburn areas) emphasises the importance of providing affordable facility provision accessible on a pay and play basis.

The review acknowledges that participation levels across the borough are some of the lowest in London and low levels of participation around the three existing centres provide a further indicator of the need for change and improvement to facility provision in these areas.

Borough-wide Facility Analysis

The focus of this element of the study has been to determine how any proposed developments at the three sites would provide appropriate facilities which are needed across the borough as a whole. It was vital therefore to conduct an outline analysis of borough-wide facility provision. The facility analysis was also critical in determining the level of demand for the existing facility mix at each centre. Using a combination of approaches, Sport England's Strategic Planning Tools (the Facilities Planning Model, Actives Places Power) alongside facility catchment mapping, the analysis has proved conclusive in confirming the need for key facility types currently accommodated at the three centres.

The review has established specifically that sports hall provision across the borough is substantial, but accessibility is limited. A number of facilities located at school sites do not allow community access and an opportunity exists to increase capacity further by working with schools to allow greater public use. In relation to the three centres under review, the provision of existing accessible and affordable sports hall space is highly important, particularly in Stonebridge and Kilburn (Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre and Charteris Sports Centre) where alternative public provision is limited. Planned provision including the development of the Wembley and Copland Academies in central Brent as well as the potential development as part of the South Kilburn NDC masterplan may help to reduce any future deficit in access to, and in turn supply of, affordable indoor sports space.

Health and fitness facility provision across Brent is below the London average for facility provision per 1000 population and there is an evident need to increase the capacity and quantity of health and fitness stations across the borough, particularly public access facilities (which often do not require expensive registered membership for use.) All three centres under review play an important role in providing accessible and affordable facilities, in or near to areas of income

deprivation. Any redevelopment options or new facility provision at the three main sites should therefore seek to increase the capacity of this facility type further to meet identified borough-wide and local needs.

Swimming Provision and Demand for a Third Pool

The study confirms that the provision for swimming across the borough is critically low with just two community accessible pools currently in operation. Despite the planned development of additional swimming facilities outside the borough boundary, the construction of at least one additional community swimming pool within Brent remains a priority. Whilst the identification of defined locations for new provision was outside the remit of this study, analysis suggests a third pool in the north / central area of the borough would appear to serve the greatest levels of identified demand from Brent residents both now and over the next 10 – 15 years.

Improving and or replacing the swimming pool at Vale Farm Sports Centre are also regarded as priorities. However, further investigation into the current status, lifespan and economic viability of the existing pool facility is required to determine likely timescales and any detailed cost of such development.

Options Appraisal

The options appraisal process, in line with standard practice, applied an initial 'do minimum' cost for all of the three centres. This provides a benchmark of total on-going costs if just the most necessary ongoing maintenance and improvements were undertaken.

The options appraisal then proceeded to provide an outline indication of the best value option at each site (do minimum, refurbishment / redevelopment, new build) by comparing the total cost position over a 25 year period. At all three sites, because of the increased income and improved operational efficiency that could be realised through new build (more so than refurbishment), this option represented the greatest value for money by a considerable margin.

Table 1: Total cost position over 25 years for all centres combined:

Option	Total Cost	Net Present Value
--------	------------	-------------------

Do Minimum	£53.73m	£34.82m
Refurbishment	£50.59m	£33.34m
New Build	£28.04m	£19.42m
Facility closures	N/A	N/A

Through consultation and planning policy analysis, the leading issues surrounding any future development of each of the three sites have been discussed within the review. Where necessary, the study highlights where further investigations by LB Brent are required in order to determine and address some of the more complex issues which will influence the Council's investment decisions and how each project can be progressed.

Charteris Sports Centre

The least complex and expensive of the three sites, the preferred option for development identified involves the new build of the centre in-situ but replacing the sports hall with a health and fitness facility of greater capacity (which is in demand locally) alongside a dedicated dance studio. The outline capital cost associated with this option has been estimated at £1.3 million, and, due to the increased income generated through improved functionality and operational efficiency, the options appraisal recognises a the total cost position over 25 years as a slight surplus of approx £0.73 million.

Public access sports hall provision in this area of the borough is in deficit and to proceed with this option (to close the sports hall) would require other projects planned locally to provide suitable replacement facilities for indoor sport. The development plans of the South Kilburn NDC in particular require further clarification as to the content of any leisure provision and potential for indoor sports space. Alongside this is the planned development of St Augustine's school which would provide suitable indoor sports hall space in the local catchment of Charteris.

Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre

The review discusses in detail the complexities of the Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre site. Owned by the Greater London Council, the current covenant for the site requires further clarification to determine the future requirement for the re-provision of leisure and community facilities as part of any re-development. Furthermore, the future plans for the neighbouring derelict Unisys site also have the potential to heavily influence any future development option taken forward.

Considerable evidence supports the need for a community leisure centre in this area of the borough. The options appraisal process has identified that new build would represent the greatest value for money by some margin, with real potential to attract greater usage in an area of need. The site holds the potential for enabling development (residential) which could form the central capital funding source for the project. The estimated cost of this option is £7.6million which could be funded through a capital receipt of an estimated £9.9million for enabling development of the land on which Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre stands. Over a 25 year period, initial estimations suggest that the total cost position would be in the region of a £1.2 million deficit which, including all lifecycle costs associated with the new facility, represents notably better value for money.

A number of key issues remain for the Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre site. Firstly, whether the neighbouring Unisys site should be included (possibly through a compulsory purchase order) as part of a whole site development, and if so what the likely impact on costs and timescales would be. Secondly, if the neighbouring Unisys site remains derelict, will the project see a negative impact on the sale value of any residential developments at the site, reducing capital contributions and potentially the overall quality of the scheme. Finally, Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre was previously owned by the Greater London Council, and full confirmation of the terms and conditions and financial impact of redeveloping the site is required before any project can progress. Determining the level of re-provision required for the existing community facilities and a substantial number of business units at the site are of central importance.

Vale Farm Sports Centre

The potential to develop a multi-sport hub site at the Vale Farm site is a real possibility coupled with the lack of swimming pool space in Brent which should remain a major concern and influence in securing this site for sport. The importance of protecting the site is emphasised within LB Brent Planning Policy, but this also prohibits any enabling development and the possibility of any capital receipt for sale of any part of the site to be used to fund any new leisure development proposed. Outline capital cost estimates demonstrate that new build, estimated at £12.9 million, would represent greater value for money (and has the potential to attract greater levels of participation) than any form of refurbishment with the total cost position over 25 years representing a deficit of approximately £26.9 million for new build, set against £28.8 million for refurbishment (which would include capital costs for refurbishment estimated in the region of £6.4 million).

The site holds potential for development as a major community sports centre in West London and a decision will need to be made as to whether LB Brent can, alongside other priority projects, afford to pursue the new build option at the site. Whilst the project requires significant capital investment, in the long-term the new build option provides better value for money.

How LB Brent Moves Forward – Priorities for Development

The strategic review has focused on the current leisure centres in Brent providing an outline as to the needs and priorities of LB Brent for future provision and the best value for money solutions which address local and borough-wide strategic need. The review process has clearly confirmed that the development of a new swimming pool facility would address the most urgent shortfall within the borough.

As agreed with the Client Team at LB Brent at the outset of this project, this review does not provide any detailed analysis of the development of a new pool, having specifically concentrated on the solutions and options for the three centres. However, moving forward with the options we have presented for the three centres is of course influenced by the need for increasing the provision of swimming in Brent and its impact across the borough in relation to levels of participation and activity.

What follows is the Consultant Team’s priority list for development by LB Brent and a brief explanation of the key issues which influence both the position of the project on the priority list and the potential to realise any new development proposed.

Priority	Project	Facility Type / Changes	Key Issues
1	New Pool	New build swimming pool	<p>Borough-wide strategic facility deficiency.</p> <p>Potential to have significant impact upon levels of activity and participation as has been witnessed recently at Willesden Sports Centre.</p> <p>Location remains undetermined but central and north areas of borough show greatest need.</p> <p>Funding and capital costs undetermined at this stage as not part of original strategic review process.</p> <p>Dry side mix and potential for dual use centre has not been investigated but should be considered as a priority.</p>

Priority	Project	Facility Type / Changes	Key Issues
			<p>Key issues influencing delivery include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of a suitable and affordable site. ○ LB Brent identifying site specific capital or S106 fund for example to provide funding towards new development. ○ Further survey works on current leisure stock (Vale Farm in particular) do not lead to significant budget and funding having to be diverted to keeping current stock viable. <p>Next Steps Required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully detailed feasibility study and business plan for the third pool site for decision alongside the leisure stock changes before summer 2008.
2	Bridge Park	New build dry side sport and community facilities	<p>The affordability of the project has been assessed as part of the review and the mixed use development with housing highlights that a new build project is affordable for LB Brent set against the current cost of the facilities in situ.</p> <p>The Consultant Team recommend that due to the complexities of the surrounding area, the Bridge Park site alone is developed for leisure and housing on the understanding with LB Brent planning department that the Unisys site will be given some priority for future development.</p> <p>The development of the Bridge Park site would provide an affordable leisure facility and have a very positive impact upon the quality of facilities on offer for the local catchment and for the borough in general.</p> <p>Key issues influencing delivery include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Housing valuations and planning can be realised. ○ GLC covenant is not prohibitive. ○ Planning and regeneration team commit to long term regeneration of Unisys site. <p>Next Steps Required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fully detailed design and feasibility for the Bridge Park site.
3	Charteris	New build health and fitness facility	<p>The smallest of the main sites scoring high on affordability and deliverability. However, it would not have such an impact upon the overall borough-wide levels of provision outside of health and fitness given its scale, and thus is less of a priority than the leading 2 projects.</p> <p>The continued provision of this local community</p>

Priority	Project	Facility Type / Changes	Key Issues
			<p>focused facility is dependent upon the plans being discussed for leisure provision in relation to local needs (and planning priority for indoor space).</p> <p>Key issues influencing delivery include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Progress and timing of any new developments and provision of indoor sports space, notably the NDC project and St Augustine's school. o Budgetary issues for the first 2 priority projects and the potential need to channel site value for Charteris into new pool site as a higher priority project. <p>Next Steps Required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leisure team to gain a steer on the leisure mix in the NDC project by March 2008. 2. Await detailed outcomes of priority projects 1 and 2 and review site options for Charteris.
4	Vale Farm	New build wet and dry side sports complex incorporating outdoor sports facilities	<p>The impact of Vale Farm would be felt across the borough, however it is a longer term vision at present than the needs identified in the review.</p> <p>The needs of the new swimming pool and the affordability of Bridge Park and Charteris place them higher in terms of priorities for LB Brent.</p> <p>Questions remain over the longevity of current building which need to be answered and the key issue is that the on-going provision of swimming in Brent is protected and increased.</p> <p>Key issues influencing delivery include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Budgetary issues from the leading priority projects. o The need to ensure continued service delivery of swimming in particular on the site, given borough-wide shortfall at present. o Clarity on the longevity of the building and if the immediate to medium term provision for swimming is to be under threat and additional financial resources are required to be diverted to this project. <p>Next Steps Required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vale Farm intrusive condition survey to determine whether immediate remedial action is required to extend on-going

Priority	Project	Facility Type / Changes	Key Issues
			<p>service.</p> <p>2. A more in depth design and business planning process to determine both the economic life of the facility. More detailed capital costs of the facility changes proposed should be compared with the other 3 projects to assist in decision making for summer 2008.</p>

It is clear that LB Brent has a number of important decisions to make as to how to progress with the identified and required changes to the current leisure facility stock and sports centres in the borough.

It is also clear that the current situation does not provide value for money set against the proposed new build outline costs which have been identified.

The borough as a whole has a significant way to go to both drive up the levels of participation and also address the facility shortfalls and dated leisure stock which is currently on offer. As demonstrated by Willesden Sports Centre, modern, fit for purpose facilities have the potential to make a major impact by attracting considerably higher usage levels.

The Consultant Team feels that the completion of this review process will enable LB Brent to achieve further positive change through significant additions and improvements to the borough's leisure facility stock.

The information below is taken from consultants review showing the options appraisals for the three sports centres and the estimated cost of each option.

Options Appraisal Best Practise

Following accepted best practice in options appraisals a 'Do Minimum' option has been considered to test whether any significant change and investment is worthwhile in the long term. A range of further options involving varying levels of investment have also been considered specific to each centre with financial appraisal where possible.

Each option has been modelled on a 25 year whole life cost basis to allow for a truer comparison of the costs of each option over the expected life of a leisure building. Each option has been discounted back to the Net Present Value, again as per HM Treasury best practice for investment options appraisals. Key assumptions made in the options appraisal process are detailed within Appendix 5 of the consultants report.

Capital Costs

Quantity Surveyors Davis Langdon have compiled outline estimates associated with the new build options based upon an average cost per m2 calculated across a number of recent leisure centre developments across London. Mid to upper range new build costs have been used within the options appraisal process to ensure conservative estimates.

Definitions

Each option presents a breakdown of costs as set out within Table 9.1. To ensure clarity, a definition of each element is provided below. Income and expenditure figures are based upon 25 year lifecycles. Figures provided by LB Brent form the income and expenditure figures presented within the options for each of the centres.

Terms	Definitions
Capital	Capital cost associated with undertaking the option
Enabling Development	Potential to develop the site for residential, commercial or other purposes which could result in capital gains for the council that could be invested into the project.
Council Contribution	Investment required from the council to cover the capital costs associated with the option
Income	Projected income over 25 years
Expenditure	Projected expenditure over 25 years
Lifecycle	Total cost of ownership inclusive of utility, operations, maintenance, periodic and other costs across the lifespan of the project (based upon 1.25% - 2% of initial construction costs per annum)

Finance Costs	The costs associated with any Council contributions financed through prudential borrowing (at 4.82% over 25 years)
Total Costs/Surplus	Total cost position after 25 years
NPV	Net Present Value (present values of the annual cash flows minus the initial investment)
Projected Current Spend	Current spend on the three centres revenue inflated by RPI over 25 years, providing a sensible baseline of costs.

Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre

Summary of Options

The table below sets out the outline costs for the options presented. The figures indicate that the do minimum and refurbishment options for Bridge Park do not represent value for money compared against the new build options.

This is primarily because the new build would greatly increase the levels of income generation through the provision of more attractive and more efficient facilities. Coupled with some enabling development this allows revenue savings to be recycled into supporting the costs of investment.

As confirmed by the pros and cons of each option, Option 3 is the leading option. It represents the greatest opportunity to redevelop in demand leisure facilities to meet the needs of the local demographic. Option 3 does not however, provide a solution for the Unisys site, which, as detailed in Option 4 brings with it significant potential costs.

Bridge Park Options 1 to 5 - Outline Costs

	Option 1 Do Minimum	Option 2 Refurbishment	Option 3 New Build	Option 4 Re-development of total site	Option 5 Facility Closure and sale of site
Capital	1,680,000	3,849,750	7,699,500	Costs undeterminable at this stage	Costs undeterminable at this stage
Enabling Development	0	0	9,900,000		
Council Contribution	1,680,000	3,849,750	2,200,500		
Income	19,703,399	24,260,519	28,716,842		
Expenditure	33,436,444	33,747,503	29,543,745		
Lifecycle	6,931,804	5,545,443	4,159,082		
Finance Costs	2,920,550	6,692,492	3,777,291		
Total Costs/Surplus	23,585,399	21,724,919	1,208,694		
NPV	15,250,827	14,212,603	1,370,511		

Bridge Park Option 1	
For	Against
+ minimal disruption to existing operation	- income generation poor for a dry-side

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and no impact on community facility mix + facility well liked locally + current level of subsidy consistent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> centre - no impact on issues with facility design and layout and limited opportunity to increase participation in an area of need - doesn't represent value for money in the long term - maintenance costs likely to increase as facility ages - doesn't address Unisys site issue
---	--

Bridge Park Option 2	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + potential for some improvements to the centre design and function (which may increase usage) + facility well liked locally + current level of subsidy consistent + no (or minimal) impact on existing community facility mix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - income generation poor for a dry-side centre - impact on facility design and layout through refurbishment may not be sufficient increase participation (and income generation) - doesn't represent value for money in the long term - maintenance costs likely to increase as facility ages - doesn't address Unisys site issue - requires facility closure

Bridge Park Option 3	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + potential to develop modern centre with fit for purpose facility mix and design which could increase usage and participation (and income) in an area of need + project could be funded in part or all through enabling development + construction of new facility whilst existing centre in operation would reduce disruption + greater potential to meet the terms and conditions of the GLC covenants + represents better value for money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - doesn't address Unisys site issue - impact and future of community facilities requires determining (and re-provision may be a requirement of GLC covenant) - size of the sports centre may be restricted by they scale of the residential development

Bridge Park Option 4	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + incorporates Unisys site into the scheme + potential to develop modern centre with fit for purpose facility mix and design which could increase usage and participation (and income) in an area of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impact and future of community facilities requires determining (and re-provision may be a requirement of GLC covenant) - complex and difficult issue of future of

Bridge Park Option 4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> need + larger site footprint may be available for sports centre + project could be funded in part or all through enabling development + construction of new facility whilst existing centre still in operation would reduce disruption + greater potential to meet the terms and conditions of the GLC covenants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unisys site - costs and timescales associated with CPO (if required) - impact an identified flood risk may cause further difficulties

Bridge Park Option 5	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + non- traditional leisure centre with facility provision inhibited by current design and layout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - financial implications and difficulties associated with re-provision of leisure centre locally - impact and future of community facilities requires determining (and re-provision may be a requirement of GLC covenant) - no leisure / community provision on-site would be an unpopular decision publicly - complex and difficult issue of future of Unisys site - costs and timescales associated with CPO (if required) - impact an identified flood risk may cause further difficulties

Charteris Sports Centre Summary of Options

As with Bridge Park, the figures demonstrate that new build and redevelopment represents considerably greater value for money than maintaining the facility in its current condition. Specifically for Charteris the new build cost also provides a better option for long term financial viability. Charteris Sports Centre is well liked by its current users due to its residential location and community feel. Improvements to the centre through new build or redevelopment can enhance efficiency, increase value and local participation further.

Charteris Options 1 to 4 - Outline Costs

	Option 1 Do Minimum	Option 2 Re-development	Option 3 New Build	Option 4 Facility Closure and sale of site
Capital	335,760	671,520	1,343,040	Potential capital receipt of £900k combined with lifecycle costs saving
Enabling Development	0	0	0	
Council Contribution	335,760	671,520	1,343,040	
Income	3,976,560	8,852,231	14,007,181	
Expenditure	4,141,331	6,752,494	10,254,084	
Lifecycle	1,209,129	967,303	725,477	
Finance Costs	560,345	1,120,690	2,296,835	
Total Costs/Surplus	1,934,245	(11,744)	(730,784)	
NPV	1,270,765	109,657	(275,632)	

Charteris Option 1	
For	Against
+ facility analysis identifies demand for existing facility mix (and shortfalls of publicly accessible provision for these facility types)	- ancillary facilities not fit for purpose and design and layout poor
+ minimal disruption to existing service	- sports hall design issues inhibit use and lack of dance studio space causes conflicts of interest across user groups
+ high levels of user satisfaction with existing provision	- does not represent long term value for money
+ current running costs low (but likely to increase as facility ages)	- facility aging and concerns raised over structural condition

Charteris Option 2	
For	Against
+ potential to increase health and fitness capacity, usage and income generation whilst combating local shortfall of play and access facilities	- re-development of sports hall dependant on planned developments locally
+ anecdotal evidence suggests some users prefer the smaller / local feel of the facility in contrast to a large purpose built leisure centre (e.g. WSC)	- capital investment required
+ current design of sports hall limits usage	- scope for refurbishment may be constrained by existing building
+ represents better value for money long term than 'do minimum'	- disruption to operation during refurbishment
	- site access and lack of car parking

Charteris Option 3

For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + potential to increase health and fitness capacity, usage and income generation whilst combating local shortfall of play and access facilities + ensures improvements to design, layout, functionality and operational efficiency of the centre + anecdotal evidence suggests some users prefer the smaller / local feel of the facility in contrast to a large purpose built leisure centre + current design of sports hall limits usage + represents best value for money long term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - re-development of sports hall dependant on planned developments locally - capital investment required - proximity of local residential and limitations of site may prohibit developments - site access and lack of car parking - facility closure during construction

Charteris Option 4	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + existing facility mix, design and layout limits function usage and income generation + potential to realise capital receipt for investment into better quality, fit for purpose leisure facility provision + concerns over structural condition of the facility and economic life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - facilities whilst not fit for purpose, do serve a purpose and user satisfaction is high - facility closure and re-investment into another project (e.g. local school) may not be perceived well publicly

Vale Farm Sports Centre Summary of Options

Over 25 years the cost efficiencies and potential for increased income generation through new build represent a total cost that is below the do minimum and refurbishment options. The additional benefits are clear of a fit for purpose leisure centre in relation to increasing participation levels and associated social benefits. Facility refurbishment would require a period of facility closure which could be avoided through new build (on the assumption that the development of the new facility adjacent to existing is feasible).

Vale Farm Options 1 to 4 - Outline Costs

	Option1 Do Minimum	Option 2 Re-development	Option 3 New Build	Option 4 Facility Closure
Capital	2,584,951	6,462,377	12,924,754	NA
Enabling Development	0	0	0	
Council Contribution	2,584,951	6,462,377	12,924,754	
Income	34,514,338	37,511,870	46,325,300	
Expenditure	46,952,305	46,749,019	44,086,142	
Lifecycle	11,636,062	9,308,850	6,981,637	
Finance Costs	4,134,238	10,335,595	22,166,823	
Total Costs/Surplus	28,208,267	28,881,595	26,909,302	
NPV	18,300,158	18,815,930	18,028,110	

Vale Farm Option 1	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + recognised need for existing facility mix in current location and one of only two public access pools within Brent) + school use of facilities substantial + recent investment and progressive refurbishment improving quality of some aspects of the facility (health and fitness facility in particular) + capital investment significant but lowest of all options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high repair and maintenance costs that are likely to increase - facility inefficient in current state - some facilities and ancillary facilities not in demand and not fit for purpose (e.g. squash courts and team changing area) - usage levels falling (as is customer satisfaction) and potential to increase participation may be limited - facility reaching the end of economic life - STP location and condition requires redress - Future of athletics track and infield undetermined - some disruption to existing operation and any required maintenance to pool would cause difficulties

Vale Farm Option 2	
For	Against

Vale Farm Option 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + recognised need for existing facility mix in current location and one of only two public access pools within Brent) + school use of facilities substantial + some increase in usage and income generation through improved facility provision and centre layout + incorporates improvements to the outdoor facilities + capital costs significant but lower than new build 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impact on facility efficiency and income generation significantly lower than new for new build - facility reaching the end of economic life so value for money questionable - disruption to existing operation and would require closure of pool

Vale Farm Option 3	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + potential to develop modern centre with fit for purpose facility mix and design which could increase usage and participation (and income) + opportunity to explore the development of Vale Farm Sports Ground, moving towards a multi-sport hub site + could allow the development of a new facility whilst the existing centre remains open, minimising disruption, particularly to swimming + represents best value for money long term + regarded as preferred option by LB Brent Planning department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capital costs significant and no enabling development possible - not regarded as an ideal location for the development of a major sports facility due to issues around access and public transport and in relation to other priority areas of the borough

Vale Farm Option 4	
For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + savings in on-going management and maintenance (which may be significant if the condition survey determines that the facility is not structurally sound) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - site protected by planning policy and improvement of facilities recognised as a priority - currently one of only two public access swimming pools in Brent - closure would not be a popular decision locally - future use for the site would require determining, no enabling development possible

Combined Summary of Options

The table below sets out a summary of the total project costs and a combination of the figures across the three centres for the various options presented. These are set against the current projected current spend on the three centres revenue inflated by RPI over 25 years which provides an useful indicator of baseline costs. The figures indicate that the do minimum and refurbishment options do not represent value for money compared against the build options. Combined, new build options fall below projected current spend. As discussed, this is primarily because the new build solutions will all greatly increase the levels of income

generation at each of the centres through the provision of more attractive and more efficient facilities. Coupled with some enabling development, in the case of Bridge Park, this allows revenue savings to be recycled into supporting the costs of investment.

Options for Brent Leisure Centres - Combined Outline Costs

Facility / option	Total over 25 years	NPV
Bridge Park		
Do minimum	£23.56m	£15.25m
Refurbishment	£21.72m	£14.21m
New Build	£1.21m	£1.37m
New build and total site redevelopment	NA	NA
Facility closure and site redevelopment	NA	NA
Charteris		
Do minimum	£1.93m	£1.27m
Refurbishment	(£12k)	£110k
New Build	(£731k)	(£276k)
Facility closure and site redevelopment (residential)	NA	NA
Vale Farm		
Do minimum	£28.21m	£18.30m
Refurbishment	£28.88m	£18.82m
New Build	£26.91m	£18.03m
Facility closure	NA	NA
All Centres Combined		
Do Minimum	£53.73m	£34.82m
Refurbishment	£50.59m	£33.34m
New Build	£28.04m	£19.42m
Facility closures	NA	NA
Projected current spend	£28.08m	£17.63