APPENDIX 1

COUNCIL HQ – OPTIONS APPRAISAL – SUMMARY TABLE

| DESCRIPTION | CAPITAL COST | NET REVENUE * COST | AVERAGE ANNUAL RUNNING COST | WHOLE LIFE PROJECT COSTS / 30 YEARS | COMMENTS |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <u>Option 1 – Do Minimum</u> – Minimal expenditure responding to building failures as they arise. | £10.62m (Years 1-5 only) | £415,594 pa | £1,551,613 | £54.066m | Little or no improvement in building efficiency. Minimum essential repairs only. No early improvement in current standard of accommodation. Significant risk associated with services/building failure and business continuity Poorest option in value for money terms. Requires extension of leases at other office sites. |
| 2) i) <u>Option 2</u> – New Build – Full scale replacement Provision of new facility on alternative site ii) <u>Option 2a</u> – as above but with office space reduction to 0.8 desks per FTE | £22.72m £20.94m | £374,562 pa £164,271 pa | £919,642 £815,869 | £48.470m £43.790m | Assumes relocation from MBF site Delivers average 50% reduction in occupied floor space Achieves in excess of 100% of carbon reduction target for office accommodation Up-front capital expenditure of c£21-23m in first 2 years of project. MB site available for disposal. No renewal of leases at Abbotsford House/Callander Square. |
| 3) i) <u>Option 3 -</u> <u>Refurbishment</u> – Refurbishment of existing complex on like for like basis | £12.17m | £480,440 pa | £1.522,944 | £54.822m | Does not include any reconfiguration thus unsuitable for modern working practices. Poor space utilisation Low grade accommodation post refurbishment. Requires extension of leases at other office sites. Need for decant and temporary accommodation. |

| DESCRIPTION | CAPITAL COST | NET REVENUE * COST | AVERAGE ANNUAL RUNNING COST | WHOLE LIFE PROJECT COSTS / 30 YEARS | COMMENTS |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| ii) <u>Option 3a</u> Remodelling, eg to create additional capacity, creating 'open-plan' office environment. | £20.63m | £529,545 pa | £1,065.079 | £50.451m | -Improves capacity and building efficiency - Key risks in this approach are i) structural integrity of building ii) need for decant & temporary accommodation iii) logistics/ICT continuity iv) asbestos removal costs and the impact on contract programme and duration v) may require extension dependant on floor space capacity achieved |
| 4)i) <u>Option 4</u> Staged approach phase development of new office and civic/town hall accommodation ii) <u>Option 4a</u> as above but with office space reduction to 0.8 desks per FTE | £22.72m £20.94m | £424,649 pa £215,239 pa | £894,729 £791,837 | £47.772m £43.116m | Scores highest in non financial appraisal Achieves in excess of 100% of carbon reduction target for office accommodation Delivers average 50% reduction in occupied floor space. Highest value for money rating Lowest running costs Best option in non-financial appraisal terms Provides flexible approach Opportunity to utilise frontage of existing site for phased new development. 0.8 desks option offers greater efficiencies/lower costs |

* based on a current revenue cost of £1,731,280 and on an estimate of loan charges £60,000 per annum for every £1m borrowed over 30 years.