

# Feasibility 3B – Detailed Review

## A. Minimal Retention Option – New Stage Servicing Arrangements



- Requires new stage/service corridor arrangements
- This will tie into modular plant area and into modular storage, WC changing facilities.
- Cost assumed to be £150-200K for Stage Servicing arrangements and £200K for modular changing accommodation/storage & site set up (owned)

# Feasibility 3B – Detailed Review

## A. Minimal Retention Option – Modular Plant Arrangements



- Requires new base and tie in arrangements
- Cost estimated at circa £300K (owned)

### Updating of FTH Non Theatre Systems

- DSSR have estimated that £350-£400k also requires to be spent on ventilation plant, LPHW systems, security/fire and emergency lighting systems, lift and external lighting upgrades.



# Feasibility 3B – Detailed Review

## A. Minimal Retention Option – Other Issues



- Retention of FTH causes difficulty in redeveloping any residual sites
- Culvert at side of FTH is problematic to any potential extensions to existing town hall

# Feasibility 3B – Detailed Review

## A. Minimal Retention Option – Conclusion

To disentangle the office block and retain the FTH for operation for say a period of 3-5 years, until a replacement facility is built, would cost in the region of

- **£1.4M to £1.65M**

If the FTH is to be repaired based on an update of the 2017 Condition Survey (as adjusted) it is estimated that a further **£664K** would be required to allow the facility to operate for a further 5 years ie doing all outstanding repairs .

In total, this would be a budget of circa **£2.064M - £2.314M.**





# Feasibility 3B – Detailed Review

## A. Minimal Retention Option – Conclusion

For FTH to be fully refurbished, extended to overcome its deficiencies, or brought up to zero carbon will require a further review exercise (Feasibility 3C) and a full brief of requirements has to be produced, to allow this option to be costed.

However, a review of the 2017 Condition Survey costs (to Q2 2022) estimates that between £2.77M and £4.123M should have been spent. The Council did not progress any of the recommendations, so it is likely that some elements are in a far worse state and will require additional work. NOTE – the roof now needs complete repairs as it, and many of the other systems are at the end of their useful life.

NOTE – these repairs do not address any of the deficiencies of FTH



## Appendix 5

## Summary of General Services Initial Project Allocations & Expenditure to Date for HQ & AC Project

The initial HQ&AC business plan was produced as part of the decision making in Sept 2020 and fed into the Capital Programme budget setting in March 2021. At this time, the project was costed assuming development was to be on the Municipal Building (MB) site – hence the fact that no receipt was attributed to the sale of the MB site. Various iterations of this project budget have been produced when consideration was given to developing in the town centre and acquiring a site to contrast the overall cost of the project to the Council. The following is the current approved funding model.

HQ & AC Budget Breakdown from Business Case (Mar 21)	Initial Allocation (£000)	Pre 20/21	20/21	21/22	22/23 (Envisaged Full Year)	Total as at end of 22/23	Comments
Block 4 Refurbishment	750	0	37,699	659,391	220,000	917,090	Enabling Project to clear Muni & Test NWWW, additional spend in 22/23 to accommodate Members moves. As well as £750K capital, there is £235K dilapidations in non operational budgets and a £30K contribution from Children's services for the production kitchen. Total £1.015M (See additional funds below)
Stadium Refurbishment	1500	0	20,103	6,875	1,473,022	1,500,000	Enabling Project to clear Sealock & DTH
Muni Blg Demol	1000	0	7,925	105,103	686,972	800,000	Enabling Project to remove liabilities of Muni Blg includes Disconnections, Demo Contract & Fees. The remaining £200K allocation is for the removal of the office block, as a future phase.
Westbank Acquisition	125	0	0	0	185,000	185,000	DV updated valuation, increased from the £125K allocated (£185k plus fees).
Relocation of Data Centre to Foundry/Links to other off	1000	0	25,969	331,736	642,295	1,000,000	ICT Controlling budget
FFE	1500	0	0	401,416	498,584	900,000	21/22 and as at Jul 22 costs are for Foundry Furniture, the remaining 22/23 expenditure will be for Stadium, leaving the residual £600K for the new HQ in future years
Site Investigations & Client Fees	1500	362,109	112,440	158,803	70,000	703,352	This pot was for Construction fees, but has been eroded for the various feasibilities and abortive costs. The remainder of the fee allocation at £900K will be insufficient to support the new build project and will need increased.
FTH Demolition	180	0	0	0	0	0	Assumed budget would be required after new facility opens, and FTH demolished. May need to review figure as relocation of SPEN substation in plant room will cost circa £200K
Abbotsford/Rossvail Demolitions	800	0	0	0	0	0	Assumed budget for demolitions, may need increased due to CPI increase. Would demolish to save rates liabilities and holding costs, prior to sale of sites
Construction of New HQ&AC Blg - baseline costing	37500	0	0	0	0	0	When final decision on what is required a recosting exercise will be required but likely to be far in excess of the £37.5M due to CPI increases and aspiration creep.
Spend in previous years	395	0	0	0	0	0	Now broken down, please note Scot Govt Grant funding for zero carbon may require to be repaid (£30K) and FC owes Hub East Central abortive fees of circa £300K for the 2015 HQ project if no new HQ project is forthcoming.
Capital Receipts (Ring Fenced to Project)							
Sealock/Park St/Rossvail/Abbotsford	-1250						
Gross Costs	45000	362,109	204,136	1,663,324	3,775,873	6,005,442	

Items in Yellow as per Sept 20 Council decision and Financial Approvals at Budget setting in March 2021.

As time has elapsed, many of the enabling office transformation projects have/will complete this financial year.

It is recommended that a new Project Business Plan, and budget, now be created once there is clarity on the direction of travel that the new Council wish to pursue for the project. This will enable better articulation of the project costs moving forward, and will effectively allow a resetting of the total project delivery budget required, which can be more easily monitored and managed.