

Report of Director of City Development

Report to Executive Board

Date: 15th February 2013

Subject: West Park Centre Options Appraisal

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Weetwood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. This report considers the future of the West Park Centre in the context of the outcome of the consultation undertaken with users and the health and safety issues that currently exist which led to the temporary closure of the building in November 2012.
2. West Park centre provides facilities for a range of city-wide and local activities including the main user Artforms, who used the building as their office base and to provide delivery of the schools music service, external cultural organisations such as Leeds Symphony Orchestra and West Riding Opera who used the centre for rehearsals and performances and local community users.
3. Since the departure of Northern Ballet and Opera North to new premises approximately 40% of the building has been unoccupied. In November 2012 the building was temporarily closed due to concerns about the safety of the electrical installations in the building.
4. A consultation exercise has been undertaken with existing users which highlighted a preference for the building to remain as a centre for cultural activities.
5. This report considers the options available to the council to provide appropriate facilities for city-wide and local users and concludes that two options be further developed and reported back to Executive Board in April. These are the option for partial demolition of the West Park Centre with the remainder re-opened and the option to decant city wide services elsewhere with a local community facility

developed on the West Park site (referred to as Options 2 and 5 respectively in the report).

Recommendations

Executive Board is asked to note the contents of this report and approve that:

- i) Officers further develop Options 2 and 5 in consultation with potential users and report back to Executive Board in April 2013 with detailed proposals and costs;
- ii) Note the proposal to dispose of part of the West Park site that is implicit to the delivery of either option 5, or 2.
- iii) The boundary between land to the immediate East of the West Park Centre and the site for the Queen Elizabeth II Fields In Trust scheme follows the existing fence line and site boundary as detailed in Appendix 1.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider and determine the future of the West Park Centre in the context of the outcome of the consultation undertaken with users and the health and safety issues that currently exist which led to the temporary closure of the building in November 2012.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The West Park Centre is a former secondary school which opened in 1951 and closed in 1989. A site plan is attached to the report as Plan 1.
- 2.2 After being used as a temporary decant for nearby schools the centre was occupied by the schools music service. Opera North and Northern Ballet were based in the centre for a number of years but moved out in 2009 and 2010 respectively following significant investment in the Grand Theatre refurbishment and Northern Ballet Theatre, which included financial support from the Council.
- 2.3 Since then the building has been mainly used to provide facilities for Artforms, the schools music and arts service. As such the property management of the building was carried out by the Education Service. Artforms used it as office space as well as for service delivery, taking advantage of the large hall, smaller spaces suitable for rehearsals and space for instrument storage. Artforms let rooms in the building to a variety of groups, but particularly organisations looking for space for music and dance rehearsals and performances. These groups came from across the city and further afield. There are six additional external organisations that were based in the centre, including two groups who deliver services to children and adults with disabilities. There is also local community use for activities such as Zumba classes and diet clubs as well as a local church who use the building for services each Sunday.
- 2.4 Looking at the usage of the building more closely, it is evident that a sizeable proportion is providing city-wide services and the balance being more locally based as outlined in Appendix 2.
- 2.5 The majority of regular use is from organisations who do not use the building for its location in the particular locality and could therefore relocate to another area of the city.
- 2.6 Following Opera North's and Northern Ballet's departures a significant proportion of the building has become disused. At this time (September 2009) a condition survey was carried out which identified £2.2m of backlog maintenance. Of this £711k was for electrical services, £641k for mechanical services, £508k for external walls, windows and doors and £240k for roofs. The remaining £100k was for various other items.
- 2.7 The building does have high running costs (approximately £350k per year). These costs are high due to a combination of the building's size, age, inefficient design and lack of energy saving measures in place. Income from room hire is approximately £45k pa, which offsets some of this expenditure.

2.8 Following a deputation to Council from various local community organisations in April 2011, Exec Board instructed officers to begin an options appraisal into the future of the building. As a result a consultation exercise took place later that year. This was in the form of a consultation evening, questionnaire (which is attached at Appendix 3) and one to one meetings. The consultation resulted in 135 responses being received. The consultation asked a number of questions and gave space for further comments. Fifty eight respondents took this opportunity to express their preferred option. All of them preferred options that would continue to see service delivered on site, with the majority preferring either partial demolition or use of the building as it is. The analysis of the responses indicates that most came from people outside North West Leeds which is probably a reflection of the city-wide usage that the facility supports. However, during consultation the location of the facility was seen as a strength. Common themes that were expressed were the availability of free parking, easy access to the ring road and good public transport links. Only 18% of consultees were from groups covering an area within one mile of the centre and of these 68% only used the centre monthly. Charts showing the main results from the consultation are attached at Appendix 4.

2.9 In recent years the Council has been consolidating the management and maintenance of property under the responsibility of Corporate Property Management. Accordingly, responsibility for the building management transferred to Corporate Property Management in the autumn of 2012 with Children's Services remaining the principal client occupier. Further to a maintenance inspection being undertaken the West Park Centre was temporarily closed by the Acting Chief Asset Management Officer in consultation with the Executive Member for Development and Economy on 2nd November 2012 due to health and safety concerns identified. Principally the issues identified related to the condition of the electrics and water penetration into the fabric of the building. Following the temporary closure an independent inspection was carried out by one of the Council's retained Technical Advisers, Arup. The brief for this work was finalised following consultation with the Members for Weetwood and Kirkstall Wards. Arup's report, which is available as a background document, outlined that the level of expenditure required to bring the building into what might be considered a satisfactory environment for the various activities that the it hosted is significant but could only be determined in detail following fuller survey work . As an initial estimate Arup reported that the backlog works required were as follows:

- Provision of new electrical distribution and switchgear throughout - £396,000
- Provision of new automatic fire alarm and detection installation - £108,000
- Provision of new emergency lighting installation - £45,000
- Provision of new lightning detection installation - £25,000
- Provision of new hot and cold water distribution throughout - £216,000
- New Boiler and primary services - £120,000
- Priority 1 & 2 building fabric elements - £21,279
- **Total - £931,279**

These figures only account for the minimum building fabric elements and as part of a refurbishment programme it is likely that more comprehensive works will be required as outlined in the 2009 condition survey.

In addition, the report also confirmed that, in Arup's opinion, the temporary closure of the building was the correct course of action given the nature of the issues that they identified during their inspection. In particular Arup noted that:

“The absence of compliant building services installations present a potential health and safety risk and in our opinion justify the decision to close the facility to public occupation.”

- 2.10 The closure displaced a number of organisations and clearly caused disruption and inconvenience to a large number of existing users. However, work undertaken by City Development and Children's Services has led to the temporary relocation of users. Artforms offices have been relocated to Merrion House with music service delivery taking place at City of Leeds School. The majority of external users have relocated to alternative venues, mainly in North West Leeds, that are suitable in the long term. The loss of the late opening hours and dedicated space at the West Park Centre has particularly impacted on organisations such as Youth Services and YAMSEN, who provide services for people with special educational needs.
- 2.11 Members will also recall that in December 2012 they approved a report which agreed to the playing fields to the South and East of the site being nominated under the Queen Elizabeth II Fields In Trust scheme as part of the Council's commitment to maintaining the playing fields as a valuable and important recreational amenity for the long term. As part of this report consideration needs to be given to the small piece of land to the East of the West Park Centre which falls outside the playing field boundary. It is proposed that the existing fence line is used as the boundary and that the land to the East of the fence line is included within the Queen Elizabeth II Fields in Trust scheme. The West Park Centre site would be as detailed in the plan at Appendix 1.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The West Park Centre provides valuable facilities particularly to music and dance organisations who value the building for its large main hall with good acoustic properties, the varying sizes of rooms and access to instrument storage. The centre has developed into something of a musical and dance hub, attracting users from across the city and further afield. User numbers are relatively high, particularly on Friday evenings when around 150 children attend Leeds Youth Orchestra rehearsals. The centre is also valued by the local community who use it as a community centre for activities such as diet groups, dance classes and services from organisations such as the NHS stop smoking service. It is also used by a local church as their place of worship each Sunday, which often attracts over 200 attendees.
- 3.2 However, it is also evident there are significant issues with the building. A condition survey undertaken by Education Leeds in 2009 highlighted £2.2m of backlog maintenance works that were required to maintain the fabric of the building and its services in an appropriate state of repair. The building also has high annual running costs, which (including premises related staffing) are £352,263 per year. Consequently, in considering the future of the building, careful thought will need to be given to the level of capital investment required.

Importantly, the backlog maintenance figures identified by the 2009 survey and by Arup do not include any works for remodelling of the building and addressing its general decorative state. Accordingly, a full refurbishment programme is likely to exceed the £2.2m backlog maintenance figure quoted. In addition, the Council would also need to be comfortable of meeting the ongoing revenue costs of the building in the context of the unprecedented budgetary pressures it faces across all areas of its activity. It would be possible to only carry out the most urgent works, but given the long term solution needed, a partial repair that doesn't address most of the elements would only serve to delay the further investment that would be needed in the building.

Options Appraisal

3.3 Taking these issues into account consideration needs to be given to the future of the West Park Centre. Using the feedback from the consultation an options appraisal has been undertaken, that aims to:

- meet the needs of the centre's users;
- consider the options for meeting the city-wide and local requirements taking account of all of the property options available, including partner facilities;
- ensure that any solutions identified are fit for purpose and to;
- ensure that the capital and revenue costs that would need to be met are sustainable over the longer term.

3.4 On the basis of the above, five options have been considered which are:

- Option 1 – Retention of the West Park Centre building in its entirety.
- Option 2 – Partial demolition of the West Park Centre and re-opening of the remainder.
- Option 3 – Demolition of the West Park Centre and new facility built on site for Artforms and other existing users.
- Option 4 – Demolition of the West Park Centre and decant to alternative premises elsewhere.
- Option 5 - Demolition of the West Park Centre and decant city wide services elsewhere with a local community facility developed on the existing site

Each of the options identified above are considered further below.

3.5 Option 1 – Retention of the whole West Park Centre building

This option would involve the re-opening of the whole West Park Centre once backlog maintenance had been carried out. Officers are of the view that if a long term sustainable solution is to be secured then a comprehensive refurbishment programme will need to be brought forward, rather than an approach that seeks to do the bare minimum, which would only serve to forestall further maintenance issues in the short to medium term. The total backlog maintenance issues were identified at £2.2m in the condition survey carried out in September 2009.

Pros:

- the whole centre would re-open and all previous users would be able to return to West Park;
- running costs would reduce slightly as small savings would be made on utilities following upgrade of the plant and windows;
- this is the most popular option identified through the consultation.

Cons:

- the £2.2m to fund the backlog maintenance works would need to be found by the Council;
- the works would only fix identified problems with the building, they would not be a full refurbishment, the costs of which would be significantly higher;
- the running costs would remain relatively high as the building would still be, by modern standards, an inefficient 1950s property;
- the space that is currently disused would either remain so or could be marketed for hire to generate income, although letting the space for anything like market value would be difficult and operational costs are likely to exceed any income generated.

3.6 Option 2 – Partial demolition of the West Park Centre and re-opening of the remainder.

This option would see the retention of the existing office block as well as the main hall and section of the building leading down to the rehearsal room. Consideration of this option was highlighted by Arup in their 2012 report. The required backlog maintenance would then be carried out on the retained building. Using figures from the condition survey it is estimated that this would cost c£1.15m. The remainder of the property, approximately 44%, would be demolished at an approximate cost of £373k.

Pros:

- most of the users prior to the centre's closure would be able to return to West park when works were complete;
- the area of the site that would be cleared as part of the demolition, could be made available for development and potentially could generate around £2.0 to £2.4m, which could finance the works required;
- Non-staffing running costs for the building would reduce by approximately 44%, which would equate to revised annual running costs of approximately £136k

Cons:

- this option would only fix identified problems with the building rather than be a full refurbishment, the cost of which would be significantly higher;
- The £1.52m (£1.15m in backlog maintenance and £373k for demolition) would need to be found by the Council. There is the potential to utilise the capital receipt from the sale of the balance of the site;

- Running costs, although less due to the building size reduction and a slightly more efficient building, would still be proportionately high by modern standards.

3.7 Option 3 – Demolition of the West Park Centre and new facility built on site for Artforms and other existing users.

This option would see the West Park Centre demolished and a new centre built on site to a specification suitable for Artforms and other existing users needs. NPS Leeds, the Council's retained design services partner, undertook an appraisal of this option and estimated that total costs would be £4.5m, which includes £627k for demolition of the existing building and the development of a new centre of 1,373m² at a cost of £3.9m inclusive of fees and contingencies.

Pros:

- the new building would be to modern specification and would provide a well designed and modern environment for the foreseeable future;
- most of the users prior to the centre's closure would be able to return to West Park once the building works were complete;
- non-staffing running costs would reduce by approximately 60% to c£90k per annum;

Cons:

- capital costs for a new build of this size would be in the region of £4.5m. Although there is potential for a capital receipt from the sale of the balance of the site which could raise c£2.5m, the remaining £2m would need to be found by the Council.
- The timescale for the delivery of this development would be in the region of 2½ years.

3.8 Option 4 – Demolition of the West Park Centre and move to alternative premises elsewhere.

This option would entail the Council identifying options across its property estate that delivers appropriate solutions to meet the needs of services users which would result in the West Park Centre being surplus to the Council's requirements. In considering the information identified in Table 1 it is evident that the majority of usage of the facility is city wide and it may therefore be possible to meet their needs by better utilising existing properties. Currently the principle city wide users are based in the following facilities:

- Artforms offices – Merrion House
- Artforms music service delivery – City of Leeds School
- Blah Blah Blah Theatre Company – offices in Wortley
- Leeds Festival Chorus – St Chad's Parish Centre, Headingley

- Leeds Symphony Orchestra – St Chad’s Parish Centre, Headingley
- Musical Arc – Meanwood Community Centre
- West Riding Opera – St Chad’s Parish Centre, Headingley

In addition, the main local users are accommodated in the following facilities:

- Airedale/Wharfedale Dog Training St Paul’s Church Hall, Tinshill
- Leeds Reformed Baptist Church – own premises in Headingley
- Leeds NHS – West Park United Reformed Church
- Youth Services – West Park United Reformed Church
- Zumba – Leeds Reformed Baptist Church, Headingley

From the above it is apparent that a number of users have already been accommodated temporarily in buildings which may be able to provide more permanent solutions. In particular, Artforms’ service delivery from City of Leeds School has been successful to date and the music service would like to continue delivering from the school. Members are also asked to note that for some services, such as YAMSEN, it is understood that their temporary solution does not meet their long-term needs.

However there are existing surplus premises in the Council’s estate which, when looking on a city-wide basis, may be worthy of more detailed consideration. East Leeds Leisure Centre is just one example of a building that is in a much better state of repair than West Park and could potentially provide accommodation for users such as Artemis who are currently based in Holbeck and the Schools Library Service, based in the Beckett Park Centre.

Under this option the West Park Centre would be demolished and sold as a capital receipt. A portion of the capital receipt could be made available to facilitate any decant proposals.

Pros:

- The option would make optimal use of the Council’s existing property portfolio.
- Could provide a near city centre location for music service delivery
- Part of any capital receipt could be invested into the agreed decant proposals to facilitate any moves.
- This option could provide a base for Artemis and Schools Library Service allowing them to relocate away from problematic premises and co-locate to achieve service synergies;
- Operational costs have the potential to be reduced, but could only be quantified following more detailed examination of this option;
- would release the whole of the West Park site for potential disposal and estimated capital receipt of c£3.5m.

Cons:

- This option would result in the loss of the West Park Centre as a location for city-wide services and also a community facility in the local area.
- There could be a fragmentation of the cultural activities that take place at the centre which would need to be carefully considered and managed.

Option 5 - Demolition of the West Park Centre and decant city-wide services elsewhere with a local community facility developed on the existing site

This option is essentially the same as option 4 above, however, it would also entail the development of a new community facility on part of the site, which would be intended to meet the needs of local users. A possible location for the community facility is set out at Appendix 5. City wide users could use the facility if preferred, or the Council could facilitate other decant options as outlined in option 4. At this early stage it is estimated that a new community facility would be some 200 - 300m² in size and cost some £0.7 - £1.0m to construct, plus a further £627k for the demolition of the existing building. The balance of the site shown on Plan 3 would be available as a capital receipt which would generate an estimated £2.9m which would finance the development of a new facility.

Pros:

- The option would make good use of the Council's existing property portfolio.
- Part of any capital receipt could be invested into the agreed decant proposals to facilitate any moves, including a new community facility.
- This option could provide a base for Artemis and Schools Library Service allowing them to relocate away from problematic premises and co-locate to achieve service synergies;
- Operational costs have the potential to be reduced, but could only be quantified following more detailed examination of this option;
- would release the majority of the West Park site for potential disposal and estimated capital receipt which could in part be reinvested into new on site facilities.

Cons:

- This option would result in the loss of the West Park Centre as a location for city-wide services, although local community facilities would remain.
- There could be a fragmentation of the cultural activities that take place at the centre which would need to be carefully considered and managed.

3.9 Summary of Option Appraisal

In looking at the five options detailed above, it is evident that careful consideration needs to be given to the way forward. West Park Centre is seen as a valuable resource by many of its users, the building is vacant and any undue delay in agreeing a way forward is likely to result in further deterioration in the property. It

is also evident that the building needs substantial works to be undertaken to make it safe for occupation.

- 3.10 Taking all of these points into account, Option 1 – Retention of the whole West Park Centre building, is not recommended for the following reasons:
 - 3.10 A large proportion of the building has not been in use for sometime.
 - 3.11 The costs of refurbishment would have to be met from the Council's Capital Programme and is currently unfunded.
 - 3.12 The ongoing revenue costs for operating the building would remain relatively high and would have to be met in the context of the severe budget constraints that the Council faces.
 - 3.13 The existing use of the building does not require its full refurbishment.
 - 3.14 Similarly, the demolition of West Park and the development of a new facility to host Artforms (option 3) is not recommended either. Such a proposal would come at a significant cost, which again would require funding from the Capital Programme, plus ongoing revenue support and would not make best use of the Council's existing property estate.
 - 3.15 On that basis it is felt that closer consideration should be given to the remaining options. Option 2, which considers partial demolition of the site may be feasible, however, it may be more sustainable in the long term to consider the development of a smaller, community based facility on the site with the city-wide functions being relocated in existing Council and partner facilities. Accordingly, option 5 would balance the retention of some of West Park Centre with purpose built new facilities to meet local need and provide a sustainable solution that could be delivered without placing an increased financial cost onto the Council. It is considered that the retention of community facilities on the West Park site would better respond to the consultation feedback than the option 4 proposal, which would lead to the sale of the entire site.
 - 3.16 On that basis it is proposed that Options 2 and 5 be given more detailed consideration. Option 5 may have merit, however it would require more detailed feasibility and close consultation with existing users. In addition, partial demolition as set out in Option 2 was the most popular option from the consultation and while it may appear to be more expensive at this time than Option 5, it merits further investigation. .

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Following the request from Executive Board, public consultation took place towards the end of 2011. This was in the form of an open evening held at the centre, a circulated questionnaire and one to one meetings with the centre's main users. The results of this consultation have been summarised at paragraph 2.8 and has informed the outcome of the option appraisal alongside the practicalities

of the building's condition and the capital and revenue running costs involved in its refurbishment.

4.1.2 The Weetwood Ward Members have been consulted about the future of West Park. They have expressed the view that the whole centre should be re-opened at the earliest opportunity.

4.1.3 In addition, given the proximity of West Park to Kirkstall Ward, the Kirkstall Ward Members have also been consulted. They have also expressed the view that the whole centre should be re-opened at the earliest opportunity.

4.1.4 Significant consultation was undertaken following the closure of the centre to try and find alternative accommodation for the existing users as quickly as possible.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 An equality, diversity, cohesion and integration assessment has been produced and is attached at Appendix 6. This assessment has found that the recommended options could have a detrimental impact on the West Park community, particularly those users with special needs. This impact could be mitigated by building a new community facility on site.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 The future of West Park needs to be considered in the context of the Sustainable Economy and Culture City Priority Plan outcome "All people of Leeds will enjoy the benefits of a vibrant, culturally rich city". This report seeks to balance local need with the ability of the Council to facilitate services for the benefit of the whole city by using all of its property portfolio.

4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 West Park Centre is a large building and currently it is larger than its users require with as much as 40% of the building unused prior to its closure. This, alongside its inefficient layout, old installations and single glazed windows make it a particularly expensive property to manage. Total running costs are approximately £350k per year including £105k for business rates, £40-50k per year for gas, £20-25k per year for electricity and cleaning of around £50k. The remainder is made up of property related staffing and minor items.

4.4.2 Running cost estimates have been produced for options 1-3. Net of staffing these estimates the costs for each option to be:

- Option 1 - £237k pa
- Option 2 - £136k pa
- Option 3 - £90k pa

Running costs for options 4 and 5 would require more analysis and would be subject to a detailed decant proposal being developed, although they are likely To provide significant revenue savings.

4.4.3 Capital costs and valuations have been produced for options 1-5. The site has development potential for housing and has been valued on that basis. The plan at Appendix 1 shows the proposed boundary for disposal, which is the area outside the Jubilee Playing Fields area. The site is also considered as having potential for a free school, although it should be noted that for a free school Department for Education would have to purchase the site at market value. It is proposed that should a specific interest for a Free School come forward, then the Council would seek the market value for the site;

4.4.4 The capital implications from each option are estimated to be:

	Capital cost	Potential capital receipt	Net capital receipt
Option 1	£2.20m	£0.0m	- £2.20m
Option 2	£1.70m	£2.2m	£0.50m
Option 3	£4.50m	£2.3m	- £2.20m
Option 4	£0.63m*	£3.5m	£2.87m*
Option 5	up to £1.60m*	£2.9m	£1.3m*

* plus potential additional decant costs which are not known at this time.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 It has been suggested that there are restrictive covenants on the site. This was looked into in 1994 when the Council received an opinion from counsel into the enforceability of restrictions contained in the 1947 conveyance. This opinion stated that the restrictions are statements of intent not contractual obligations or covenants and they could not be binding against the Council or a purchaser from the Council.

4.5.2 There are no implications for Access to Information.

4.5.3 The report is subject to Call In.

4.6 Risk Management

All of the options outlined in this report contain a degree of risk. All prices for demolition and construction could change once more detailed feasibility and cost planning is undertaken. In addition, it is evident that, given the poor condition of the West Park Centre, doing nothing is not an option. It is on that basis that this report recommends a preferred and reserve course of action that is progressed in a timely way so that costs and further feasibility can be developed to a more detailed stage. This will provide additional certainty to Members before a final proposal is implemented, whilst also maintaining a reserve option should the preferred approach prove less beneficial following further development.

5 Conclusions

5.1 The West Park Centre is a valued resource in the North West of Leeds. It was home to Artforms, YAMSEN, Musical Arc and used by organisations such as

West Riding Opera, Leeds Symphony Orchestra and Phoenix Concert Band until it temporarily closed in November 2012.

5.2 Decisions need to be made regarding the future of the West park Centre to give some certainty to the users about where and how they can deliver their services in the future.

5.3 An options appraisal has been undertaken that explored the potential to:

- Retain the whole West Park Centre building;
- Demolish part of the building and re-open the remainder;
- Demolish the existing building and build a new facility for all users on site;
- Demolish the existing building and relocate elsewhere;
- Demolish the existing building, construct a local community facility on site and relocate city-wide users elsewhere

The option appraisal highlighted the pros and cons of each option and also the issues relating to backlog maintenance, unknown costs of a full refurbishment (in whole or in part), the potential to realise a capital receipt to support options development and ongoing running cost issues.

5.4 On balance, it is evident that Options 2 and 5 merit more detailed consideration prior to members making an informed decision on the preferred option and it is therefore proposed further feasibility work is undertaken into Options 2 and 5 with the outcomes reported to Executive Board on 24th April.

6 Recommendations

6.1 Executive Board is asked to note the contents of this report and approve that:

- i) Officers further develop Options 2 and 5 in consultation with potential users and report back to Executive Board in April 2013 with detailed proposals and costs;
- ii) Note the proposal to dispose of part of the West Park site that is implicit to the delivery of either option 5, or 2.
- iii) The boundary between land to the immediate East of the West Park Centre and the site for the Queen Elizabeth II Fields In Trust scheme follows the existing fence line and site boundary as detailed in Appendix 1.

7 Background Documents¹

Condition Survey Report 2009

Arup Report November 2012.

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.