

Extract from minutes of –

**Development Committee,
Tuesday, 3rd December, 2013**

“The Committee considered the undernoted report:

“1 Relevant Background Information

- 1.1** *Members will recall that the SP&R committee agreed ‘in principle’ to progress both the Olympia and Andersonstown Leisure Centres to Stage 2 of the Capital Programme to form the first phase of the citywide leisure transformation review*

In order to inform the investment decision for the Olympia project, in June members agreed that external support should be commissioned to carry out an optional appraisal on community provision and support requirements for the area. The research should develop options; determine the strengths and weaknesses of the identified options; ensure options are framed within the overall strategic framework and action plan for area wide development; provide outline costs for each viable option and to highlight and explore the potential sources of capital and revenue funding; and identify the resources required to carry through and ultimately the prospects for success.

- 1.3** *The report outlining the shortlist of options was presented to committee in October. Given the complexity, committee requested the report to be deferred to allow for party briefings. The purpose of this paper is to summarise any comments and / or concerns in relation to the identified options for the future delivery of community centre and service support for the Olympia/Windsor/Village area of the city in the context of the broader regeneration of the Olympia/Windsor stadium.*

2 *Key Issues*

- 2.1** *The option appraisal was commissioned in order to inform any Development Committee decision on the best approach to address any gap left in community service provision as a result of the planned closure of the Olympia CC as part of the broader Stadia Development.*

- 2.2** *The consultants completed an area profile in order to inform supply and demand and communicated*

findings from their community engagement exercise. To summarise, this identified 6 options around 3 primary areas:

Do nothing: This is based on the current council consideration to develop the site i.e. where there would be no Council-managed community centre or services on site (with the exception of the play areas accommodated within the stadium redevelopment) and no replacement centre or services elsewhere in the local area.

Extend Existing Service Provision: Options 2 & 3 relate to the relocation and extension of existing service programmes both within other BCC community centres, bookable space in the new Leisure facility and other community sector facilities in the area. These options relate to any conclusion that there is adequate current provision for community bookable space in the area.

The remaining options relate to any alternative conclusion which proposes there is a demonstrable need for additional community space in the area. The report considers 2 potential methods: support for existing community organisation's plan to extend community space (Option 4) or alternatively council consideration of new community build (2 possible locations – Options 5 & 6)

2.6 Following monetary assessment, risk assessment and optimism bias adjustments, the consultant's recommendation is to support Option 4: namely supplementing the proposed further use of Council and community sector buildings in the area with the provision of additional community space via the refurbishment of St Simon's Hall. Their assessment suggests this proposal will meet local need and demand and will do so at a much lower cost level (both capital and recurrent) than the new build options at Tate's Avenue and the Village area respectively

2.7 The primary issues raised at the Party Briefings are summarised as:

2.8 Current Service Users
1. Elected members sought clarity on the ongoing needs of the current users of the Olympia Community Centre. They noted that the majority of the block bookings were from regional groups or individual providers and that these users could be accommodated elsewhere within the community and leisure centre estate in the city.

2. They sought assurance that the proposals set out at option 3 would meet the needs of the remaining user groups who would need / wish to continue to access local services at the new planned development.

3. All parties discussed how the Development Committee might inform the programming of the community facilities within the new building to ensure that the community space identified within the plans facilitate local community provision. They further considered how to ensure that related booking systems, etc would not be detrimental to community access.

2.9

Additional bookable Community space

4. Parties noted the preferred option to address the perceived need for additional bookable community space in the Village area, however, some parties did so within the context of the variety of current community service providers all of whom are financially supported through the service grant programme.

5. In considering the balance of service need and provision in the area, elected members sought clarity on how the sum £1.3m was identified for replacement community facilities currently included in the strategic outline case for the Stadium development. They recognised is a provisional planning figure based on the cost for similar council community facilities, uplifted for inflation.

6. Members noted that Option 4 presents an alternative solution which does not require capital build but would require capital investment of approximately £520,000.

7. While Members were generally supportive in principle of this approach they stated that any future capital investment in St Simon's Hall should be tentative and subject to a full economic appraisal.

8. Some parties felt that any future capital investment decisions for community centre provision should be part of a city wide needs analysis.

2.10

The Committee received a deputation of representatives from the recently formed Olympia Community Centre Support Group at the November meeting. Group representatives summarised their assessment of community need and asked committee to favour Option 5 (new build: Tates Avenue) which they contend is ranked second in the consultants assessment. The recommendation noted in the consultancy report however ranks Option 5 third of the 3 options

which they shortlisted for appraisal (pg 38 section 11.1 Preferred Option).

- 2.11 Summary**
All parties agree that the programming within any replacement leisure facility must accommodate articulated community needs. Parties considered an opportunity for the South Area Working Group to influence the level of community programming and related community facing systems.
- 2.12** *Based on the independent needs assessment and the sought assurance re the community programming above, there was no support for any new community build option in the Tates Avenue area (Option 5).*
- 2.13** *The majority of parties supported the recommended Option 4 to extend bookable community space in the village area. Members should be aware this will require a potential council contribution for capital costs which have been estimated at £520,000 but would necessitate more detailed financial appraisal.*
- 2.14** *The majority view was therefore to support the mix of options (Option 3 & 4) on the basis this would ensure there would be no displacement of service provision for the local users from the immediate area while also allowing for a future decision to meet the demand for additional accommodation in the village area.*
- 5 Recommendations**
- 5.1** *Members are asked to note the contents of the report and to agree any related recommendation for associated capital investment to the SP&R committee.”*

The Committee agreed that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee be recommended to endorse Option 4 as set out, viz., to extend the extent of bookable community space currently available in the Greater Village area, as part of an emerging capital project. It was noted that local Members would be consulted on an ongoing basis in respect of the project.”