Body: Cabinet

Date: 9 December 2015

Subject: Devonshire Park Project

Report of: Senior Head of Regeneration, Planning and Assets, and Senior Head of Tourism and Enterprise

Ward(s) Meads

Purpose To consider the proposal for the future development of Devonshire Park to create a cultural destination.

Decision type: Key Decision

Recommendation: Cabinet is recommended to:

a) Confirm its support for the Devonshire Park redevelopment Scheme as presented in this report

b) Recommend to Council the addition of £44m to the capital programme to complete the scheme, subject to final due diligence

c) Instruct officers to continue to seek external funding sources

d) Confirm the appointment of the existing multi-disciplinary Design Team to complete the scheme

e) Approve the commencement of the public procurement processes referred to in this report to deliver the project and delegate the detailed development, management and approval of the public procurement processes to be followed and of all the procurement documentation required to deliver the project to the Senior Head of Regeneration, Planning and Assets in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and the Lawyer to the Council. Such delegation to include approval to allowing exceptions to the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules should that become necessary

f) Delegate authority to appoint all the contractors necessary to deliver the project to the Senior Head of Regeneration, Planning and Assets in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and the Lawyer to the Council.

Contact: Graham Cook, Programme Manager Devonshire Park Re-Development, Tel: 01323 415867 graham.cook@eastbourne.gov.uk
1.0 Background

1.1 In order to meet the Vision and Objectives set for the redevelopment of the Devonshire Park Complex the Council adopted a structured approach, involving detailed analysis of the site’s heritage, access and sustainability issues, design options and the business case for change.

In parallel with this strategic approach, a tactical decision was made to proceed with the essential repairs to the exteriors of the Congress and Devonshire Park Theatres.

1.2 A Planning Application and application for Listed Building Consent was submitted on 27th August 2015 and was considered by the Planning Committee on 24th November 2015.

1.3 Members have approved this structured approach in a series of Cabinet reports:

- 20 October 2010 – this report triggered by the failure of the concrete cladding of the Congress Theatre led the Council to commission a strategic review of options for the future of the Devonshire Park Complex.
- 14 December 2011 – the strategic review referred to above, led to the appointment of Marks Barfield architects. The architects proposed a number of options for the regeneration of the site and the council adopted Option 4. Key to this option was the creation of a new “front door” to the site (working title “the Welcome Building”) and a sensitive restoration and repurpose of the other buildings and the wider site.
- 12 December 2012 – following the approval of Option 4, Marks Barfield together with business planning consultants David Clarke Associates, were commissioned to develop a Masterplan which respects the heritage of the site and sets out how the financial performance could be improved through increased income and reduced running costs. The plan also highlights initial options for the future governance of the site. Based on this work the council agreed an investment of £700,000 to progress the scheme to RIBA Stage C (now known as Stage 2).
- 16 July 2014 – following the appointment of Focus Consultants as external project managers the Cabinet approved a revised budget of £950,000 to fund the full architectural and specialist advisor team needed to progress the project to RIBA Stage 2. Subsequent to the Cabinet, Levitt Bernstein heritage architects and a full team of building and theatre specialists were appointed. In addition the council has retained David Clarke Associates to continue developing the business plan and future governance models and Huntley Cartwright quantity surveyors.
- 18 March 2015 – this report gave approval to and the necessary funding for the development of the scheme to RIBA Stage 3, the submission of a planning application and the continued appointment of the multi-disciplinary Design Team.
• 21st October 2015 – this report gave approval to a budget of £500,000 to bring forward some of the Stage 4 design works, in order to gain time and improve the likelihood of obtaining competitive tenders.

2.0 Vision and Objectives

2.1 Since the start of the review of the Devonshire Park Complex there has been a clear vision to create a cultural destination and for it to be one of the most talked about locations in the South East. To achieve this the Council set out to fulfil a number of aims:

- Deal with all the necessary essential repairs to those buildings that are being retained in the new development;
- Understand the significance of the three listed buildings and carry out sensitive renovations;
- Upgrade the facilities in the buildings to enable them to be better and more fully used;
- Preserve the future of the international tennis tournament;
- Create better conference facilities;
- Create a new entrance to ‘Welcome’ the visitors and users and make the site more inclusive;
- Create significant new public realm to provide an appropriate civic setting for the new complex;
- Develop a more sustainable future for the site, reducing subsidy and increasing income.

2.1 The vision and its aims have guided the work to reach the current Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Stage 3 scheme.

3.0 Financial and Economic Benefits of Investment

3.1 The Business Case has been developed by David Clarke Associates (DCA).

Following the detailed review of the Business Case referred to in the March 2015 Cabinet report, further work has been done to ensure the Stage 3 design reflects the business case criteria and to align the revenue projections in the business case with the planned construction programme. This alignment has adopted a prudent approach as to when the new facilities will reopen.

DCA have tested the emerging design against the core business case drivers at each stage to ensure the optimum priorities are met. These drivers are outlined below along with their approximate contribution to the financial position.

Key financial drivers

1. An accessible visible, quality, visitor attraction, efficiently operable 10%
2. Theatre/live entertainment business – working main venues harder 20%
3. Conference/events – transform performance in the ‘distinctive venue’
market 40%
4. Catering & visitor spends – essential quality offer & significant income driver 30%

Financial benefits to the town rather than directly to the Devonshire Park account
5. Tennis – important to the economy and reputation of the town
6. Driving local hospitality economy through conference and event business
7. Tourism – driving prosperity and general job creation

3.2 Improvements in business and viability

DCA forecast there will be significant improvement in business in the core business of arts and entertainment provision as well as in the conference and catering businesses. The important role of the site in hosting the international tennis tournament will be safeguarded.

Central to the viability of the site and its economic value to the town, will be substantially increased conference business, where DCA forecast that once renewed, the site will host in the order of 353 events a year of varying sizes. While many will continue to be in the association and charity sector, financial yields will rise and new business can be expected in the higher value corporate sector. In total we expect conference income in the order of £1.7m per annum, of which some £531k will be hires income.

DCA anticipate catering incomes will improve given the new provision of two very attractive public catering spaces and the potential for increased food and beverage sales to conference organizers. In total we anticipate catering turnover in the order of £1.44m and net receipts/savings after all costs of £265k per annum.

3.3 Overall financial impact

The analysis by DCA shows that the site will move to a much more viable basis of operation on completion of the works. From a current subsidy in the order of £1.1m per annum, they anticipate that, after new investments in service to conferences and in managing and marketing the site, the new scheme will generate an overall improvement over the current basis in the order of £814,000 per annum.

3.4 Build up of income, risk and sensitivity

DCA state that risks and sensitivities in the business model were significantly addressed during stage 3 development. Disruption to programmes and loss of income remains a significant challenge during the construction period but the proposed construction plan is driven by the need to maintain business as far as is possible, and does so very effectively. The detailed planning of this construction programme has enabled us to develop a detailed analysis of the effects on trading and compensating savings during the sequential closure of the different buildings, and to contain the overall additional loss consequent upon the construction works to £1m. DCA also now forecast that income will
build up to the level set out above relatively quickly once works are complete. The specialist conference team comprising Devonshire Park operational staff and specialist consultant advisors has begun work on the planning of the marketing campaign for the renewed Devonshire Park and local conference businesses are assisting this process by way of a conference working group.

DCA state that whilst there are risks in growing the business, each forecast for new business has been based on detailed market appraisal and is kept to relatively modest levels. Detailed sensitivity analysis has been carried out on all assumptions and overall the sensitivity of the plan to change in any one business area is relatively modest for a scheme of this size.

3.6 Economic Impact

Focus Consultants were appointed to carry-out an economic impact assessment of the investment at Devonshire park. Their report considered both the long term post-construction benefits and the short term benefits during the construction period.

3.7 Their report identified the following key additional benefits from the project:

- Additional, projected direct visitor spend from visitors post investment to Devonshire Park = £13,419,183 per annum. (excluding consequential effects, and across the whole economy).
- Additional jobs supported in Eastbourne as a result of this additional visitor spending = 169 full time equivalent.
- Top sectors that these additional jobs will be created in = Food and Beverage Services (48 jobs), Retail (21 jobs) and Accommodation (45 jobs).
- The impact of these additional new jobs on GVA in the local economy = circa £6.1 million per annum.
- Additional demand for floor space in the town resulting from a £40 million investment in Devonshire Park = circa 400sqm retail space and 750sqm for food and beverage.
- Additional bed spaces supported = 22.
- 140 new jobs locally during the construction phase as a result of the £40 million capital expenditure.

4.0 Capital Cost

4.1 In order to arrive at the design and budget proposed in this report the project team worked with operational managers, key commercial partners, Historic England and a wide range of stakeholders to identify and then evaluate a range of options. The initial assessment produced options totalling some £75M in value, which could not be supported by the Business Case.
4.2 The full range of options was subject to prioritisation using the following categories:
   - Essential works:
   - High Priority works:
   - Medium Priority works
   - Low Priority works.

4.3 The prioritisation generated the following recommendation which was approved by the Project Board on 3rd December 2014 to guide the Design Team through the final part of Stage 2:
   - Undertake all Essential Works
   - Refine the High Priority list to bring within the remaining budget available
   - Review phasing of the works to reduce inflation impact and continue momentum of works on site.

4.4 This prioritisation meant that the following items were not pursued:
   - Extensive landscaping across the Park
   - Additional refurbishment to Winter Gardens
   - Additional refurbishment to Congress Theatre
   - Refurbishment of Racquet Court
   - Refurbishment of Devonshire Park Theatre
   - New permanent stand to Centre Court
   - Enhancement works to Towner Gallery.

4.5 In addition a number of other enhancements were considered at an early point in the Stage 2 work but not pursued:
   - environmental improvements to Wilmington Gardens
   - underground car parking
   - a range of minor works within the park.

4.6 In developing the scheme budget the following assumptions have been used:
   1. In time the construction market may become more competitive again, but for now it is prudent to allow 5.8% inflation per year resulting in a range of 7% - 20% applied across the project.
   2. Contingency of 10% is allowed for within each of the individual elements. Contingency has also been reviewed in light of the risk register and provisional allowances made within the cost plan breakdown where appropriate.
   3. The costs are based on developed designs informed by survey information and initial market testing. As the detailed design develops so too will the Cost Plan to provide more accurate and market tested costings.
   4. During Spring 2016, the two stage procurement of the main contractor will be undertaken. By July 2016 we anticipate having a contractor appointed and we will have our first market tested competitive rates, against which to compare the cost plan and make necessary adjustments prior to the main works starting on site in January 2017.
4.7 The budget approved at the Masterplan stage in 2012 was £35m. However, since that time, the construction market has experienced a substantial upturn and inflation levels have risen from 1–2% year on year to 5–6%.

The table below summarises the Masterplan budget as at 2012 and then the current forecast based on that same scheme but uplifted to reflect the current market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST/BUDGET HEADING</th>
<th>Masterplan 2012</th>
<th>Uplifted to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Total</td>
<td>£26,353,207</td>
<td>£28,988,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Total</td>
<td>£1,899,937</td>
<td>£2,089,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Total</td>
<td>£4,332,538</td>
<td>£4,765,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>£32,585,682</strong></td>
<td><strong>£35,844,250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation to mid-point construction</td>
<td>£2,500,000</td>
<td>£7,527,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£35,085,682</strong></td>
<td><strong>£43,371,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 As the above table demonstrates, simply applying inflation to the masterplan project resulted in a scheme some £8m above the originally agreed budget.

At RIBA Stage 2, with the new Design Team on board, a thorough interrogation of the project proposals was undertaken which resulted in a project with forecast estimate of £40-£42m. At that time, the published construction tender price indices were indicating an inflation figure of circa 21% over the life of the project and this was included in the forecast estimate range.

Inflation in the construction industry operates on a different scale to that of the retail price index. When forecasting construction prices, the tender price index is used. This looks at prices of materials and labour to forecast rates of increase in the industry. During the recession, a number of contractors downsized or went into administration. In conjunction with this, some of the work force left the sector to find alternative employment and suppliers reduced production. Coming out of the recession and moving into a boom period has resulted in a sharp increase in demand without the capacity in supply to resource this uptake. As such we see prices inflated and long lead in times to balance the demand/supply.

During Stage 2 published indices were indicating a year on year rise in construction prices of 5.25%. The equivalent figure is now at 5.8%. However, the forecast costs have been profiled against the construction programme to give a more accurate appreciation of the costs at each stage to help mitigate the impact.

Furthermore, at RIBA Stage 3 we have now received further survey information to inform the costings and there have been ongoing discussions with Historic England and the Planning and Conservation Department to ensure statutory permissions are secured.

4.9 The budget set at Stage 2 was £40 – £42m. The forecast cost at the end of
Stage 3 was some 20% over at £49,969,534. We summarise below the key reasons behind this, split into two categories.

1. Costs of previously specifically excluded items reintroduced in Stage 3:
   a. Devonshire Park Theatre Foyer/ WCs/ Lift - £505,000
   b. Gold Room enhancements (Extra over essential M&E) - £665,000
   c. Foul sewer diversion - £230,000
   d. Furniture – £500,000

2. Significant revisions to the scheme during Stage 3 include:
   a. Enhancement of Western Cluster refurbishment for tennis facilities
   b. Reconstruction of Winter Garden kitchen core, uplift to other catering provision
   c. Increase in Heritage work to Winter Garden including roof railings
   d. External plant facility to rear of Congress Theatre
   e. Welcome Building modest essential increase in gross internal floor area and review of glazing specification
   f. Introduction of feature stage rig in Floral Hall
   g. Allowance for some consequential park wide public realm works to circulation around the park to the North of the main buildings

4.10 A subsequent Value Engineering phase enabled this to be reduced to £44m
In carrying out the Value Engineering account was taken of:
   • work for which there would be only this opportunity to do while buildings were closed and the major components exposed
   • work which was essential to support the business case
   • work of significant heritage value

The resulting savings and final budget are shown below and result in a budget of £44m at the end of Stage 3. It is considered that to reduce the budget further would have detrimental impact to the project.
The table below outlines the Stage 3 costs before and after Value Engineering ('VE').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3 Professional Fees</th>
<th>1,425,000</th>
<th>1,425,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Costs (Statutory/ Utilities Works, Surveys etc)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Works</td>
<td>526,450</td>
<td>526,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire Park Theatre</td>
<td>1,086,019</td>
<td>252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cluster</td>
<td>1,275,218</td>
<td>653,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Theatre</td>
<td>7,837,722</td>
<td>6,889,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Building</td>
<td>11,572,512</td>
<td>11,144,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>1,446,000</td>
<td>1,353,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm &amp; Landscaping (Parkside) Phase 2</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Garden (Including Racquet Court)</td>
<td>8,193,302</td>
<td>7,592,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court Works</td>
<td>990,800</td>
<td>930,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients FF&amp;E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary/ Disruption Mitigation</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees (Stage 4 onwards)</td>
<td>4,091,543</td>
<td>3,133,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4,360,428</td>
<td>3,911,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>5,844,540</td>
<td>4,818,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 3 COST PLAN BEFORE VE</th>
<th>STAGE 3 COST PLAN AFTER VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,969,534</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 To achieve the target budget savings were made as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category A - technical and design savings £722,000 without significant impact on function, heritage, or business case.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category B - significant changes in approach/alternative funding totalling £2,070,000. Some of the most significant items in this list are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reduction in scope of theatre equipment upgrades across the site - £292,000
- External repairs to Devonshire Park Theatre funded and completed through the council’s Structural Maintenance budget - £447,000
- Cafe fit outs to be transferred to operator's responsibility - £364,000
- Omit Winter Garden railing replacement - £132,000
Category C - items totalling £3,060,000 were deferred from the scheme. The most significant of which are:

- Internal works and lift to the Devonshire Park Theatre (the boiler will be replaced) - £728,000
- External staircase from Welcome Building down to tennis courts - £231,000
- Public realm and landscaping works to wider site £657,000
- Gold Room aesthetic enhancements - £264,000
- Congress Theatre – further heritage enhancements - £173,000

These items will be subject to "first refusal" should tender prices prove competitive and/or risks are not realised enabling a release of contingency.

4.12 The table below outlines the commitment required to complete each stage of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cost Commitment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence Stage 2</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>£950,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence Stage 3 up to and including submission of Planning Applications and Listed Building Consent; also to include &quot;at risk working&quot; for Stage 4 of Devonshire Park Theatre restoration works</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>£1,425,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence Stage 4 early to assist with programming</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>Approved and Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit to the delivery of the project within budget parameters set out above</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>£44,000,000</td>
<td>For Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper is seeking commitment to £44,000,000 which will enable the delivery of the project in its entirety from December 2015 through to 2020.

5.0 Constraints

5.1 There are 3 listed buildings on the site, the Congress Theatre (grade 2* listed) and the Winter Garden and Devonshire Park Theatre (both grade 2
listed). These buildings have long term defects which will require sympathetic restoration intervention requiring Historic England approval and Listed Building Consent, as the restoration will involve modifications and material replacement (similar to the Congress façade restoration, as opposed to simple ‘like for like’ repairs).

**Following a period of negotiation and amendments to the scheme, Historic England have indicated their support for the scheme. They have provided a number of conditions regarding design details and materials to be included within the Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent which was achieved at Planning Committee on 24th November 2015.**

5.2 A key stakeholder in the in the DP Project is the LTA. The project will need to deliver significant improvements to the Tennis court layout to accommodate increased court sizes and a new show court and the LTA will also be keen to see significant improvements to the player facilities.

**Following detailed design work to improve player facilities, two schemes are under consideration by the LTA which is due to make a decision on 1st December 2015. At present the base scheme is included in the project cost.**

5.3 The buildings, in particular the Theatres, as they are currently arranged, present significant challenges for disabled access and the topography of the site presents design challenges in terms of the varying levels throughout the site which hinders connectivity between buildings.

**The approved design has successfully addressed these challenges. In order to improve access for those disabled patrons arriving by car a controlled access drop of point has now been incorporated in the plaza.**

5.4 The first construction phase of the project is scheduled to begin in summer 2016 and the overall project is programmed to complete in early 2020. During this period it will be necessary to close the Congress Theatre for 14 months, of which the last 6 months will overlap with the closure of the Winter Garden. The construction procurement process will explore how the Winter Garden could operate with a series of partial closures.

**A temporary modular kitchen will be located at the rear of the Winter Garden as the current kitchen will be demolished at an early stage of the project.**

The works will have an impact on both the conference and show programmes and plans are being developed to address this and notify hirers. The Devonshire Park Theatre programme should not be affected and the Aegon Tennis tournament will continue throughout the construction phase and no other significant business interruptions are foreseen.
6.0 Consultation

6.1 The current project has been guided by regular meetings of the cross party member led Devonshire Park Project Board.

6.2 The Project Board has been assisted by a Partnership Group, who represent a range of organisations and groups that have an interest in the site and its function. A second Group specialising in the Conference and Exhibition sector has also been consulted.

6.3 A series of Public Exhibitions took place during July and August 2015 at the 999 Roadshow, Airbourne and other venues in the town. The (albeit limited) responses were positive with recognition of the need for and benefits of the scheme. Some concerns were expressed about whether the Council would be able to fund the scheme.

6.4 Extensive consultation has also been carried out with the on-site operational teams. This was important to ensure practical solutions to current issues and inefficiencies were being developed alongside the emerging design. Besides operational managers being part of the Partnership Group, they had direct access on a one to one basis to the design team through detailed working groups.

6.5 Finally, the economic case for the investment was the subject of detailed review at the Scrutiny Committee of 7 September 2015. The Committee’s summarised findings are set out below (full minutes at Appendix 1).

6.6 The Committee debated this matter following presentations on the overall project (by Graham Cook), the internal business case (by David Clarke Associates), and the economic impact (by Focus Consultants) and Philip Evans, Senior Head of Tourism and Enterprise, on the wider tourism benefits of the project and the significant additional social benefits of the improved facilities for visitors and residents alike.

In summary the Committee invited Cabinet to take into account the overall content and findings set out below (full minutes at Appendix 1) when considering this matter. However, no specific recommendations in respect of the overall project detail or its economic rationale arose from this review.

Financial Impact and Risk

Currently the Devonshire Park Estate required a minimum investment of £10m just for repairs and maintenance to stand still. This would not lead to any business improvement.

Following the development of the site as proposed, it was anticipated that there would be a net increase in contribution of between £850k and £1m per annum.

A revenue allowance of £1m had already been set aside to compensate for inevitable revenue loss to the Council during the construction period of the project. The current medium term financial strategy provided a further
£600k to support the Council’s capital financing requirement.

Risks which could impact on cost were considered as:

- Project and client requirement changes to the specification
- Tenderer’s concerns about project risk
- Market Risks associated with the demand/supply in the sector

Mitigations to these risks included:

- Potential for further development at the site in future
- Future changes to governance of the business on the site
- Sale of the site or branding
- Market testing and engagement with the supply side

6.6 **General points relating to the overall project**

- There were opportunities to draw in additional partners to assist with future development
- An ‘Ambassador’ scheme would be adopted and implemented as an essential part of securing new conference business
- The Devonshire Park development would be seen as an anchor for the town and its impact on growth would be measured and recorded through regular bespoke surveys, and by monitoring visitor numbers
- The Council was working closely with some hoteliers to ensure there would be enough quality hotel stock to support the enhanced conference facilities.
- Methods of measuring social impact should be considered as part of the assessment of the overall benefit to Eastbourne.

**Key points relating to the economic rationale of the project**

- David Clarke Associates estimated a £814k annual improvement once the project was completed, in their experience, other comparable projects with lower returns had been successful
- A £10m investment in the upkeep of the existing buildings on the site could not be avoided due to the Council’s responsibilities for buildings with listed status. Such an investment would only enable the site to ‘stand still’ with its conference offer. This would not be sustainable in a declining market at this level
- It was generally felt that the proposed scheme was of an optimum size and design matching the economic rationale
• The consultants assured the committee that the location of the kitchen in relation to the Congress and the new Welcome building was suitable in respect of supporting the activities on the site

• Focus Consultants estimated a £13.4m annual increased spend from visitors to Devonshire Park in the Eastbourne area. With conference attendees projected to grow from 7,500 to 34,150, they contribute £9m of this increase or £342 per head, a figure supported by both sets of consultants.

7.0 Programme Phasing

7.1 The high level Programme Overview is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Meeting and Instruction to Proceed</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBA Stage 4 – Technical Design</td>
<td>August 2015 – June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/ Tender Documentation / Tender Action</td>
<td>November 2015 – March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBA Stages 5-6 – Construction &amp; Handover</td>
<td>April 2016 – December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBA Stage 7 – In Use Study and Defects Liability</td>
<td>Completes December 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 It is planned to split the project into different phases. This has been planned in order to ensure "business as usual" as much as possible and also minimise the impact of inflation.

Phase 1 Devonshire Park Theatre – Essential Repairs – Underway
Phase 2 Enabling Works, Asbestos removal, DPT Boiler replacement
Phase 3 Tennis Players Facilities
Phase 4.1 Congress Theatre
Phase 4.2 Welcome Building
Phase 4.3 Winter Garden
Phase 4.4 Demolition of Devonshire Park Halls
Phase 5 Tennis Courts
Phase 6 Public Realm

In order to keep works progressing and maintain momentum on site, the enabling works and boiler replacement are planned to follow on from the Devonshire Park Theatre – Essential Repairs in 2016. To relieve programme pressures Cabinet agreed, in October 2015, to bring forward the Stage 4 design work so that detailed designs are available to include within the contractor procurement package. This should secure better prices as the tenderers can understand more clearly the work required and associated risks.
7.3 **Construction Phasing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Construction Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Enabling Works and DPT Boiler Replacement February 2016 – November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Tennis Player Facilities July 2016 – May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4.1</td>
<td>Congress Theatre January 2017 – June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4.2</td>
<td>Welcome Building January 2017 – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4.3</td>
<td>Winter Gardens January 2018 – May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4.4</td>
<td>Demolition of Devonshire Park Halls August 2018 – September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Tennis Courts September 2018 – February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Public Realm March 2019 – June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Use Soft Landing July 2019 – December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of Defects Liability Period June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of In Use Evaluation December 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 The programme for the tennis associated works (player’s facilities and tennis courts) is under review with the LTA.

8.0 **External Funding**

8.1 An outline Funding Strategy was produced as part of the Stage 2 work which identified a range of external funding streams. Given the scale and costs of the capital expenditure, officers identified three funders to focus on:

- Heritage Lottery Fund
- Arts Council England
- Local Economic Partnership

8.2 **Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF):** A first stage capital application was made to the HLF to support the works to the Congress Theatre. Unfortunately the application was not successful because the scheme did not have high enough priority, given the calls on the HLF’s funds. The HLF have indicated that they may be prepared to discuss some revenue support for interpretation work in the future.

8.3 **Arts Council England** A number of conversations have been held with Arts Council England to explore potential funding streams. As none of the buildings that are the subject of this project are recognised as a National Portfolio Organisation.
('NPO') it is unlikely that the Devonshire Park Redevelopment will be considered for capital funding. However, there are ongoing discussions about the potential to secure revenue funding in the future and these will be continued through the delivery of the project, to help ensure the long term sustainability and investment.

8.4. **Local Economic Partnership**
Eastbourne is part of the South East LEP and has had recent success in securing funding for other infrastructure projects from this source. At present there are no calls for heritage/cultural regeneration capital scheme but we have gained a place in the investment pipeline for the scheme and will continue to pursue this opportunity.

8.5 **LTA**
As a key partner on the site, the Council and our project consultants have worked proactively with the LTA. One of our drivers is to jointly secure the future of Eastbourne as an international tennis venue meeting international court standards. As a result of our negotiations with the LTA two options for improving player facilities are under consideration and the LTA will make a decision on 1\textsuperscript{st} December 2015.

9.0 **Procurement**

9.1 Project Team
The Project Team have been procured for the full life of the project but with a break clause within the appointment to allow for the contract to be ended at any point without penalty. This has enabled consistency of team throughout whilst also ensuring there isn’t undue commitment by the Council in the early stages of the project.

9.2 The project will be split into a number of phases as outlined above and delivered through three major contracts together with a number of enabling works.

The major contracts will be:

- Boiler replacement in the Devonshire Park Theatre
- Enabling Works including utilities diversions and asbestos removal
- New tennis player facilities
- A main contract for the construction of the Welcome Building and redevelopment of the Congress Theatre and Winter Garden plus associate Public Realm
- Tennis courts and irrigation system

A fuller schedule of the proposed contracts is attached at Appendix 2.

9.3 It is likely that the Council will use a range of JCT contracts for the appointment of the contractors. There will also be a range of procurement processes followed which will depend on the nature of the contract and its value. These may range from calling off from existing frameworks, tender processes under the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules or regulated procurements using the open or restricted procedures. The most appropriate procurement process will be determined as the process of finalising the detailed specifications and requirements is undertaken.
It is anticipated that the main contract will follow the “competitive procedure with negotiation”. There are specific situations in which the Council may use this procedure. For this project it is felt that the current situation set out in the regulations is applicable:

....the contract cannot be awarded without prior negotiation because of specific circumstances related to the nature, the complexity or the legal and financial make-up or because of risks attaching to them....

The competitive negotiated procedure involves the publication of a contract notice in OJEU to enable potential suppliers to express an interest to be selected to tender. A minimum of three contractors must be invited to tender. Whilst the Council can decide to award the contract on the basis of the initial tender, it may negotiate with the contractors who submit tenders to improve their content. If it does so the process ends with a final tender on which the award decision is based.

10.0 Risk Management

10.1 A comprehensive risk matrix has been developed by The Council and Focus which has been captured in Covalent. The strategic risks for the project are summarised as follows:

- **Budget exceedance**: Cost Consultants Huntley Cartwright have been appointed directly by the Council to estimate and monitor project costs for the duration of the project to ensure it aligns with the budget set by Cabinet. The project team has held a number of structured Value Engineering Exercises to identify which cost elements contribute most to delivering the Business Case and meeting the Council’s heritage responsibilities.

- **Programme overruns**: detailed work has been undertaken by the design team to develop the programme and a specific Phasing Working Group has been set up to oversee the process. In addition work has already started to minimise any potential delays to the main contractor by carrying out asbestos surveys and commissioning public utility works (in particular the major sewer diversion). Finally, at their meeting of 21st October 2015 the Cabinet agreed to forward fund some of the Stage 4 professional work in order to advance the development of detailed designs and procurement documents and thus enable construction contractors to be appointed as soon as possible.

- **Business interruption**: some interruption to business activity is required to undertake significant restoration and equipment installation to the Congress Theatre and Winter Garden. The project has been designed to mitigate this as far as possible and a budget has been provided in both the capital project and the revenue budget to support the financial consequences.

- **Future business assumptions**: a detailed evaluation of the business case has been undertaken by a specialist consultant that confirms and supports the design principles of the project. The same specialist has also been commissioned, with additional support from Catering, Conference and Retail consultants, to continue to provide advice on the business planning aspect and future governance to ensure that
optimum commerciality is achieved for the site.

11.0 Governance

11.1 The governance framework set up to guide the development to scheme to date has worked very well and it should be retained.

12.0 Staffing Implications

Effective human resource management will be key to both maintaining the current operations leading up to closure and to ensuring sufficient appropriately trained staff with the relevant skills are in place to allow the new venues to open on time and safely. A detailed HR strategy is being drawn up and will be subject to consultation with staff and unions. The Council has an existing Redundancy and Redeployment Procedure which will be used to inform part of the strategy, however the staffing implications of such a project are complex and it is likely that new proposals will be drawn up to consider issues such as retention payments.

13.0 Financial Implications

13.1 The Council has appointed Capita Asset Services Ltd to provide advice on the robustness of the business case, potential funding options and affordability.

In addition Capita will comment on considerations regarding the any future decisions over governance that may impact on the business.

At the time of writing the work is ongoing and a final report is expected in the new year.

No material concerns have been raised to date. However, there are some points of clarity over the business case are still being addressed. These are not expected to raise any significant issues.

13.2 Overall the scheme will cost the Council in the order of £44m if all allowances for inflation and contingency are exhausted.

Whilst a Council does not finance individual schemes in its overall capital programme, clearly a scheme of this magnitude is a material consideration in the context of the overall programme. Capital expenditure is financed from:

- Grants and contributions
- Capital receipts
- Borrowing financed via revenue (the capital financing requirement)

The Council sets its own borrowing limit in the general fund. Housing borrowing is restricted by the Government.

13.3 Any additions to the capital financing requirement attract interest, via external loans and/or loss of interest if internal borrowing is used. Also capital repayments are required via the minimum revenue provision (MRP), an annual payment derived from the asset life. Capital receipts can be...
applied to repay debt at any time.

The Council’s treasury management policy and prudential indicators are used to determine the overall affordability of the capital programme. Currently the capital financing requirement (£27m) is fully financed in the general fund revenue account which equates to £1.8m per annum (12% of the net budget)

The Council had £5.4m of usable capital receipts as at 31 March 2015.

Whilst the Devonshire Park Board is seeking external support for the scheme, should there be no grants or contributions available to this particular scheme the Council will need to finance £44m of capital expenditure.

13.4 Capita has advised that the MRP can be delayed until the scheme is finished or even until the business plan is performing to capacity (projected £814k per annum by year )

The Council has a pipeline of capital receipts in the order of £30-£50m over the next five years and will need to decide via treasury policy when to apply the receipts.

Capita has provisionally advised that it is unlikely that any method of financing capital expenditure other than the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB) will be more attractive.

Currently Interest rates range from 2.4% to 3.5% on 5 to 50 year PWLB loans these are forecast to rise to a maximum of 4.5% by 2018.

The main cash flows of the scheme are in the calendar years 2017 and 2018 the Council can borrow ahead of need but needs to be mindful of the low interest on deposits and counterparty risk if surplus cash is created.

Overall the business plan can generate enough to cover the MRP even if the scheme were fully borrowed, leaving the interest to be funded by the Council’s revenue account.

Interest on the £44m would have a carrying cost of £1.5m (at today’s 50 year rate) reducing as MRP was paid.

13.5 Another way of looking at the scheme viability is that the business plan will eventually support about half the overall cost.

Therefore the scheme cannot pay for itself. The Council’s medium term financial strategy already allows for recurring growth of a further £500,000 per annum to be set aside over the next four years.

At this stage it is envisaged that capital receipts of between £12m to £20m will be set aside over the next four years to fund capital expenditure.

In addition to the capital financing costs the Council has already made provision of £1m of revenue funding to fund the cost of business interruption
over the construction phase.

In summary the implications for the Council's finances are:

1. £1m of revenue to fund business interruption (set aside in March 2015)
2. £12m-£20m of future capital receipts required to reduce the Council's CFR
3. The surplus created by the improved business post completion is required to part finance the capital investment as it is achieved.
4. The Council should continue to plan recurring growth of £500,000 per annum in its capital financing (revenue) budget in the period 2016-2020 depending on 2 and 3 above and its overall capital programme.

14.0 Legal Implications

14.1 Procurement/contracts
A detailed procurement strategy has been developed with the works and services required analysed in terms of the most appropriate grouping and procurement process by reference to the public procurement regulations and the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules. In order to ensure that an appropriate level of flexibility is maintained and the programme is not delayed it is recommended that the Cabinet delegate the detailed development, management and approval of the public procurement processes to be followed and of all the procurement documentation required to deliver the project to the Senior Head of Regeneration, Planning and Assets in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Lawyer to the Council. Such delegation to include approval to exceptions to the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules should that become necessary.

It should be noted that a number of contracts cannot be procured in the usual competitive manner due to the suppliers having exclusive rights to undertake the work. These are works relating to highways and statutory undertakings such as gas, electricity & water. Such works will be carried out under direct contracts with the suppliers and Cabinet is asked to formally note and agree this as an allowed exception to the council’s Contract Procedure Rules as part of the delegations set out in the Recommendations of this report in relation to procurement to the Senior Head of Regeneration, Planning and Assets.

14.2 State Aid
In December 2013, Cabinet considered legal advice in relation to the Council’s proposed financial support to the Devonshire Park project and agreed European Commission notification was not required. There has been no change to this position but this will be kept under review to ensure compliance with State Aid legislation.
14.3 LTA licences
The Towner is leased to the recently established Towner Trust for a period of 30 years. In addition, there is an agreement for LTA to use Towner during the main tournament. There is also a 43 year User License between the Council and the LTA dating from 1997 to permit the LTA to use the site during Tournaments.

15.0 Equality

15.1 This project will deliver substantial improvements to access throughout the site for visitors, performers and staff and will, therefore contribute significantly to the ‘disability’ protected group.

An Equality and Fairness Analysis has been produced which confirms the above which is also acknowledged in the Access statement and associated supplements.

Consultation with the Eastbourne Disability Involvement Group (EDIG) resulted in the redesigning of the drop off zone in the plaza which essentially allows the retention of a drop off point adjacent to the Congress Theatre as currently exists on the site.

EDIG also requested the provision of a Changing Places facility on the site. However, there now proposals to provide this facility in an alternative town centre location which is preferred by EDIG.

15.2 An Interim Equalities Impact Analysis has been completed to evaluate the impact of the design on users. This concluded that the scheme will generate positive improvements. Once further work has been carried out on any changes to the operational management of Devonshire Park those changes will also be evaluated.

16.0 Conclusions

16.1 Cabinet gave authority for officers to engage a Multi Disciplinary Design Team to take the Marks Barfield Masterplan forward. That work has been completed, planning permission and listed building consent have been applied for and the vision the Council has for the Devonshire Park site can be achieved.

16.2 Significant analysis has been undertaken of how the site can be developed to meet the objectives the Council has set for its future. This has included a forensic analysis in the business case to ensure the savings to be achieved through efficiencies and the generation of new and increased income streams can be realised.

16.3 The finalised design reflects the planning/listed building application and the cost plan contains the following major elements:

- a plaza which offers a new high quality public realm that aims to integrate the site with the surrounding context
- work to the Congress Theatre will improve its setting, complete its exterior restoration, restore the original interior design, improve accessibility, and improve comfort and facilities for audiences and
performers particularly cooling in the auditorium
• investment in the Winter Garden will enhance the historic character of its exterior and interior, improve accessibility throughout, reduce overheating in the Floral Hall, improve facilities for all users and increase revenue generation
• the Welcome Building includes two new large conference spaces (replacing the Devonshire Park Halls) below a highly glazed pavilion accommodating central box office, coffee/wine bar and breakout/hospitality space
• Devonshire Park Theatre works have been focused on the essential repairs to the exterior and a replacement boiler
• tennis works are in two parts. Improvements to facilities for players and officials and redesign of the tennis courts
• the catering offer at the site is being much improved through the construction of two cafes and a new production kitchen.

This investment will enable Devonshire Park to become a more competitive player in the conference and events market, secure a performance programme which drives larger and more diverse audiences, offer good quality conference and occasional catering and provide the quality of tennis facilities required by the LTA.

Background papers

The background papers used in compiling this report were as follows:

• The minutes of the Cabinet meetings on:-
  • 20 October 2010
  • 14 December 2011
  • 12 December 2012
  • 16 July 2014
  • 18 March 2015
  • 21st October 2015
• RIBA Stage 3 Report dated November 2015 by Levitt Bernstein
• Report on The Current and Potential Economic Impact of Devonshire Park dated September 2015 by Focus Consultants

To inspect or obtain copies of background papers please refer to the contact officer listed above.
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Appendix 1

Minutes of the Scrutiny Committee of 7th September 2015

The Committee debated this matter following a seminar where presentations were given to members on the overall project (by Graham Cook), the internal business case (by David Clarke Associates), and the economic impact (by Focus Consultants).

The committee commenced with a presentation from Philip Evans, Senior Head of Tourism and Enterprise, on the wider tourism benefits of the project and the significant additional social benefits of the improved facilities for visitors and residents alike.

Alan Osborne, Deputy Chief Executive gave a brief overview regarding the financing of the project covering the following areas:

- Currently the Devonshire Park Estate required a minimum investment of £10m just for repairs and maintenance to stand still. This would not lead to any business improvement

- Following the development of the site as proposed, it was anticipated that there would be a net increase in contribution of between £850k and £1m per annum, the scheme being approximately half of the council’s forecast capital expenditure over the next 5 years

- As part of a cautious approach, increases in business rate retention and other potential ‘fringe’ benefits such as new homes bonus had not been included in assessing the business case

- The development would have an estimated 50yr lifecycle, with a 50yr capital repayment period being normal for a development of this nature.

- The Council holds assets of a much greater value than the amount of investment required some of which were potentially surplus – the Council was currently undergoing an ‘asset challenge’ process and, as a result, there could be the potential for additional capital receipts to be used to assist the financing of the Council’s overall capital financing requirement.

- A revenue allowance of £1m had already been set aside to compensate for inevitable revenue loss to the Council during the construction period of the project. The current medium term financial strategy provided a further £600k to support the councils capital financing requirement.

- The Public Works Loans Board was likely to be the most cost effective method of financing any additional borrowing.

Risks which could impact on cost were considered as:

- Project and client requirement changes to the specification

- Tenderer’s concerns about project risk
· Market Risks associated with the demand/supply in the sector

Mitigations to these risks included:
· Potential for further development at the site in future
· Future changes to governance of the business on the site
· Sale of the site or branding
· Market testing and engagement with the supply side

The committee were advised that Capita would be reporting back on it’s review of the business case and affordability and financing options in late September 2015. A copy of the Capita report would be provided for Members.

Members were advised by the Deputy Chief Executive that, whilst this was clearly the Council’s largest planned capital scheme, it would not prevent the Council investing in other future capital schemes as part of the remaining capital programme. The Public Works Loans Board financing for the councils capital programme was available without condition and the Council was able to determine what it could afford and its ability to repay, with potential interest rates of between 3.4% and 3.8%.

Members were also advised that any loans could be ‘serviced’ from within the overall budget whilst the project was being completed, however, capital repayments could be deferred and capital receipts could be used to reduce initial borrowing such as to bridge the period between commencement of the project and full completion. At which point the full financial benefits of the development could start to be realised and resulting savings being diverted to the Capital Financing Budget.

In consideration of the merits of the overall project, and in particular the economic rationale, members noted, discussed and/or questioned consultants and officers on the following aspects drawn out from the presentations:

**General points relating to the overall project**

· There were opportunities to draw in additional partners to assist with future development for example the LTA and local University; the proposed branding exercise would make Eastbourne more attractive to a range of potential investors.

· The ‘Ambassador’ scheme would be adopted and implemented as an essential part of securing new conference business, particularly from Associations

· The Devonshire Park development would be seen as an anchor for the town and its impact on growth would be measured and recorded through regular bespoke surveys, and by monitoring visitor numbers

· The Council was working closely with some hoteliers to ensure there would be enough quality hotel stock to support the enhanced conference facilities. It was anticipated that this would drive investment and improvement across Eastbourne’s hotel stock as the benefits of the new facilities became apparent
Methods of measuring social impact should be considered as part of the assessment of the overall benefit to Eastbourne.

**Key points relating to the economic rationale of the project**

- David Clarke Associates estimated a £814k annual improvement once the project was completed. In response to a view that this appeared to be a very disappointing return on a £42m capital expenditure even if an estimated £10m expenditure is necessary for repairs and refurbishment, the consultant’s view was, although this was a relatively low rate of return for a project of this size, it was viable and, in their experience, other comparable projects with lower returns had been successful.

- The committee was advised by the consultants that a £10m investment in the upkeep of the existing buildings on the site could not be avoided due to the Council’s responsibilities for buildings with listed status. Such an investment would only enable the site to ‘stand still’ with its conference offer. This would not be sustainable in a declining market at this level. Thus, a key driver of the project is the transformation and elevation of the conference offer to generate significant improvements in conference income and associated catering revenues from this source.

- It was generally felt that the proposed scheme was of an optimum size and design matching the economic rationale. The Director of Tourism and Enterprise stated that, whilst, the ideal would have been for a slightly larger development, anything smaller would not be economically viable and anything significantly larger would be overreaching the business potential of the site. Thus, the development was fully supported by staff in the Council’s Tourism service delivery area.

- The Committee was advised that a primary focus on Association conferences was important given the nature of the conference offer provided by the development and its geographical location.

- The consultants assured the committee that the location of the kitchen in relation to the Congress and the new Welcome building was suitable in respect of supporting the activities on the site.

- Focus Consultants estimated a £13.4m annual increased spend from visitors to Devonshire Park in the Eastbourne area. With conference attendees projected to grow from 7,500 to 34,150, they contribute £9m of this increase or £342 per head, a figure supported by both sets of consultants.

Cabinet were invited to take into account the overall content and findings set out above when considering this matter. However, no specific recommendations in respect of the overall project detail or its economic rationale had arisen from this review.
## Appendix 2 – Procurement Schedule

### PROCUREMENT PACKAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Contract type</th>
<th>Est. Value</th>
<th>Procurement route</th>
<th>Procurement Timescales</th>
<th>Date to be let by</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer diversion</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£ 250 k</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – exception list Through Southern Water</td>
<td>At least 3 month process Application to SW – 29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2015 Response from SW anticipated 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2015</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, Water, Electricity concurrent with Sewer diversion</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£200k</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – exception list</td>
<td>At least 3 month process Discussions with utilities on going. MF to confirm payments to be raised at PTM on 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Nov 2015 Make payment 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2015</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos works</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£ 295 k</td>
<td>CPR Tender Advert or Framework</td>
<td>4 wk tender period ITT 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Dec 15 Deadline – 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jan 2016 Appt – 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jan 2016</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Nov 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Main Contract – Works
- Services Contract – no aggregation
- Works Contracts aggregated with main contract but to be award as a “small lot”
- Works Contracts aggregated with main contract but to be awarded separately - subject to OJEU as above “small lot” threshold
- Supply contracts – no aggregation
- Works contract – not aggregated with main contract
- Works contracts subject to exclusive rights – no aggregation – no competition possible
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Contract type</th>
<th>Est. Value</th>
<th>Procurement route</th>
<th>Procurement Timescales</th>
<th>Date to be let by</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITC and Pavilion</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£200k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPT internals</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£1.2m (£1.5m including boilers)</td>
<td>Restricted – OJEU Traditional</td>
<td>DEFERRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substation – legal arrangements and order placement</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – exception list</td>
<td>At least 6 month process Scope of Works 18th Dec 15 Receive Quote 29th Jan 16 Place order 5th Feb 16</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, Water, Electricity – legal arrangements and order placement</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – exception list</td>
<td>At least 6 month process Scope of Works 18th Dec 15 Receive Quote 29th Jan 16 Place order 5th Feb 16</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package</td>
<td>Contract type</td>
<td>Est. Value</td>
<td>Procurement route</td>
<td>Procurement Timescales</td>
<td>Date to be let by</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Completion date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage – internal/external</td>
<td>Supply but incl. In Works above</td>
<td>200k</td>
<td>Include in main contract</td>
<td>Include in main contract</td>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>Feb 2018</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT replacement seats</td>
<td>Works Incl above</td>
<td>£ 383 K</td>
<td>Include in main contract</td>
<td>Include in main contract</td>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>Feb 2018</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre tech equipment/grids</td>
<td>Supply but incl. in Works above</td>
<td>£1.8m</td>
<td>Include within the main contract</td>
<td>Include in main contract</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S278 Works</td>
<td>Works In the main works</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timescale to be determined by Main Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substation - works</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£ 100 K +</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – exception list</td>
<td>Timescale to be determined by Main Contractor</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, Water, Electricity - works</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>£ 100 K +</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS – exception list</td>
<td>Timescale to be determined by Main Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – Procurement Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Contract type</th>
<th>Est. Value</th>
<th>Procurement route</th>
<th>Procurement Timescales</th>
<th>Date to be let by</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement site survey</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>150k</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Underway – see survey tracker</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other surveys??</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>100k</td>
<td>CPR Quotes - CPR Tender Advert</td>
<td>Underway – see survey tracker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing service contracts</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering Contract</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT &amp; Data</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>