## PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE



Subjec	ot:	IFA Intermediate Football Restructure – Impact on	Council Faci	lities
Date:		3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2020		
Report	ting Officer:	Ryan Black, Director of Neighbourhood Services		
Report	ung Omcer.	Tyan black, birector of Neighbourhood Services		
Contact Officer:		Kelly Gilliland, Neighbourhood Services Manager	(North)	
Postrio	otad Banarta			
Resuit	cted Reports			
Is this report restricted?		Yes	No	X
l 1	f Yes, when will the	report become unrestricted?		
	After Committe	o Decision		
After Committe  After Council D				
	Some time in t			
	Never	ne ruture		
	NOVOI			
Call-in				
Is the o	decision eligible for	Call-in? Yes	X No	
4.0	D	( a. Q		
<b>1.0</b>		t or Summary of main Issues	naina current	nitch
''	.1 To provide Members with an indication of potential costs involved in bringi stock to the new IFA standard and to facilitate members in further discuss			•
		A Standard and to facilitate members in futiner discu	18810118 WILLI LI	IE IFA
	on this matter.			
2.0	Recommendation		ot all agata a	
2.1		d to note the content of this report bearing in mind the		
		tractor has been appointed to formally survey the id		
	context of the chan	ging IFA standard and the indicative costs presente	d here have b	een
	informed by officers	s experienced in the operational management of the	sites.	
2.2	The Committee is f	urther asked to consider how it wishes to proceed w	ith the alignm	ent of
	the 12 Belfast City Council pitches with the IFA's proposed new criteria for interm		•	
	_	ne estimated costs.		

## 3.0 Main report

- 3.1 At the special meeting of People and Communities Committee that was held on 20<sup>th</sup>
  November, where the IFA had been invited in to update Members on their proposed new
  criteria for Intermediate Football, Members requested that an internal exercise was
  completed to get a better understanding of what the cost implications of adhering to the
  IFA's new intermediate criteria might be for Council going forward (overall and on a site by
  site basis).
- 3.2 In preparation for the meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> November, Officers had already undertaken an initial desktop exercise to review the current status of relevant BCC pitches against the proposed new criteria with12 sites/pitches across the city where intermediate football is currently played having been identified involving 13 clubs who most frequently use those sites/pitches.
- 3.3 Officers with operational experience in the management of these 12 sites have considered the sites against the proposed standards and identified a number of criteria which the pitches will no longer satisfy. Project managers from Physical Programmes and officers of the Landscape Planning and development services have provided a set of indicative costs for major elements based on their experience of delivering the capital projects and the This has given rise to the following assumptions:

INSTALLATION REQUIRED	INDICATIVE COST
3G SYNTHETIC PITCH	£500,000
CHANGING PAVILLION	£600,000
FLOODLIGHTING	£150,000
PITCH FENCING FULL PERIMETER DISTANCE INC	
PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICLE GATES FOR	
MAINTENANCE	£32,150
OFFICIALS FENCING TO MAXIMUM 2 X 55M LENGTHS @	
£60per m ASSUMING CORRIDOR EFFECT IS REQUIRED	£6,600

Officers have no recent experience of installing covered hard standing on which to base cost estimates however in 2017 Suffolk FC requested permission to install a small covered spectator stand capable of holding up to 100 persons at the Carnanmore park pitch they held under an FMA. The cost at that time was £40,500, an allowance for 3 years of price increase has been made and a figure of £50,625 has been used as an indicative cost on all 12 sites.

- 3.5 No allowance has been made in these costings for criteria related to the presence of alternative pitch marking or goal posts as these are not considered to be of relevance to the identification of potential capital costings.
- In reviewing the sites a number of physical constraints have been identified and the options outlined assume that these constraints have the potential to be overcome, this may not be the case when the sites are formally surveyed by qualified consultants.
- Consideration has also been given to other factors such as the remaining lifespan of the 3G pitch at Hammer and the opportunity to address issues at Orangefield which arise from proximity of the current pitch to the cycle track. These are referenced in the options table at **Appendix 1.**
- 3.8 Based on the above caveats and assumptions an indicative cost to align the 12 sites with the proposed IFA standards is potentially £4,367,250.00
- 3.9 The following table indicates costs per site and a table indicating the detail of the options and costing is attached at Appendix 1.

PITCH SITE	INDICATIVE
	ESTIMATE
Grosvenor Rec	£89,375
Hammer	£1,150,625
Inverary	£57,250
Dixon	£94,375
Shore Rd 1	£707,225
Shore Rd 2	£6,600
Ulidia	£57,225
Brooke	£691,375
Suffolk	£57,225
Clarendon	£657,225
Orangefield	£109,375
Ormeau 3G	£689,375
Cliftonville *see Appendix 1 for Marrowbone option	£0
Total	£4,367,250

## 3.10 Financial & Resource Implications

None specifically in relation to this report, however as noted within sections 3.8 and 3.9, dependent on further discussion at elected members level, further information gathering at

	Appendix 1 - Options summary for alignment to new IFA Standard.		
4. 0	Appendices – Documents Attached		
3.11	None		
	Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment		
	programme priorities.		
	future cost implications which will need to be considered in the context of capital		
	relation to the application of IFA criteria to our existing pitches, there could be significant		
	officer level, and ultimately full Council consideration and decision re. how we progress in		