

Committees:		Dates:
Corporate Projects Board <i>[for decision]</i> Epping Forest & Commons <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i>		28 February 2016 11 March 2019 22 March 2019
Subject: Provision of Staff Welfare facilities at Chingford Golf Course, Epping Forest	Gateway 1-5 Authority to Start Work Light	
Unique Project Identifier: <i>Confirmed after CPB paper review.</i>		
Report of: Director of Open Spaces Report Author: Jo Hurst Business Manager Epping Forest	For Decision	
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>		

Recommendations

<p>1. Approval track, Next steps and Requested decisions</p>	<p>Project Mission Statement: Project to construct welfare facilities.</p> <p>Approval track: 3. Light</p> <p>Next Gateway: Outcome Report</p> <p>This combined Gateway 1-5 report seeks to reserve income received into Epping Forest Local Risk to construct a permanent welfare solution for staff at Chingford Golf Course during 19/20. The installation of budget solution container-style static welfare unit (Option 2) was planned during 18/19 financial year but has been refused permanent planning consent, rendering this option unviable, and instead stated a requirement for Option 1.</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>To finalise design options, planning permission and costings for delivery. To commission and deliver build through corporate providers.</p> <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <p>To approve the capitalisation of local risk funds to design and construct suitable welfare facilities for the golf team at Jubilee Retreat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve Gateway 1-5 report and progression through G5 to next Gateway
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve Option 1 – construction of permanent welfare facilities. • Budget £156K to next gateway (end of project) • Note estimated total £156K for project 																				
2. Budget	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Architect</td> <td>Design and spec solution</td> <td>Epping Forest (EF) Local Risk</td> <td>£5K</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff time 5 days</td> <td>Planning application and project management</td> <td>EF Local Risk</td> <td>£1K</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction and fitting</td> <td>Complete delivery on site</td> <td>EF Local Risk</td> <td>£150K</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>£156K</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Architect	Design and spec solution	Epping Forest (EF) Local Risk	£5K	Staff time 5 days	Planning application and project management	EF Local Risk	£1K	Construction and fitting	Complete delivery on site	EF Local Risk	£150K	Total			£156K
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)																		
Architect	Design and spec solution	Epping Forest (EF) Local Risk	£5K																		
Staff time 5 days	Planning application and project management	EF Local Risk	£1K																		
Construction and fitting	Complete delivery on site	EF Local Risk	£150K																		
Total			£156K																		
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Service Committee responsible – Epping Forest & Commons Committee</i> • <i>Senior Responsible Officer – Colin Buttery Director of Open Spaces</i> • <i>Project Board to include Epping Forest Business Manager, City Surveyors and Senior Supplier</i> 																				
4. Progress reporting	Six monthly progress reports to Spending Committee and any project changes will be sought by exception via Issue Report to Spending and Projects Sub Committees																				

Project Summary

5. Context	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Workplace (Health, Safety & Welfare) Regulations 1992 oblige employers to provide welfare facilities for the wellbeing of staff. 2. The team of 4 Greenkeepers plus supporting casual seasonal staff maintaining Chingford Golf Course have no staff welfare facilities within the existing workshop and yard
-------------------	---

	<p>provision and are 1.8 miles from the nearest full staff facility at The Warren (public toilets are available at The Caddy House 0.4 miles away).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Previous but non-compliant staff welfare facilities in the adjacent Victorian 'Jubilee Retreat' Barn were redeveloped with Mayor of London and London Marathon grant funding in 2010 to provide a clubhouse for a long-established local running club – Orion Harriers. 4. Parallel projects to re-provision staff welfare facilities within the clubhouse extension or a depot extension shared with a telecommunications provider at the site failed after the provider withdrew from the project. A Gateway Report in February 2017 closed the project. 5. The Greenkeeping team continue to use a neighbouring vacant residential flat – 1 Jubilee Retreat - for toilet, shower, office and other welfare facilities on a temporary basis, which does not comply with the building's C3(a) Use Class under the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 6. To preserve housing stock in the Borough, the Local Planning Authority will not support the change of use of the flat to D2 Assembly and Leisure. 7. H&S Audits have recommended that the provision of improved, office and welfare facilities for this team are provided as a priority within the existing depot facility. 8. The installation of budget solution container-style static welfare unit (Option 2) was planned during 18/19 financial year but were refused permanent planning consent, with temporary use limited to three years and a requirement that permanent facilities would need to be constructed by autumn 2021, rendering this option unviable. 9. An unplanned licence application from TfL to use a nearby carpark on Forest Land has brought in income sufficient to finance such as construction if capitalised during 18/19 financial year. No similar unbudgeted income is foreseen in 19/20.
<p>6. Brief description of project</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 'fit for purpose' welfare facilities for staff maintaining Chingford Golf Course, Epping Forest, including toilet, small canteen and desk space either inside the existing workshop depot, or in an extension or annexe to the existing building.

	2. This in turn will release Flat 1 which can be returned to residential occupation or rental.
7. Consequences if project not approved	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City Corporation is in breach of The Workplace (Health, Safety & Welfare) Regulations 1992. 2. The City Corporation remains in breach of the Town & Country Planning (Use classes) Order 1987. 3. Continued poor support of the immediate Greenkeeping team, with potential impacts on morale, staff retention and recruitment.
8. SMART Project Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide toilet and washing facilities and office space for the Chingford Golf Course Greenkeeping team by 31st March 2020 2. To vacate Flat 1 Jubilee Retreat by the same date in order to refurbish for domestic occupation/rental. 3. To improve connectivity to IT systems to Greenkeepers through provision of desk space and computer terminal.
9. Key Benefits	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greenkeeper team can operate in a fit for purpose sanitary environment and have a warm dry refuge from bad weather. 2. Flat 1 can be refurbished and returned to domestic occupation, either as a staff lodge or let to a member of the public. 3. The City Corporate avoids enforcement action from either The HSE and Local Planning Officers. 4. Staff can access on-line files (including risk assessments, emails and other key documentation) from site. 5. Staff are able to carry out desk-based tasks without having to travel to other EF sites.
10. Project category	1. Health and safety
11. Project priority	A. Essential
12. Notable exclusions	This project does not include the refurbishment of Flat 1 Jubilee Retreat which is being managed through a different work stream.

Options Appraisal

13. Overview of options	1. Previous architect plans were for very high specification and high cost solution at approximately £200K. A lower, but
--------------------------------	--

	<p>satisfactory specification can be achieved for £100K - £150K. <i>This option is recommended</i></p> <p>2. A lower budget option of up to £40K, using a container-style static ready-made unit has been explored, but denied necessary long-term planning permission, therefore <i>this option is not recommended</i>.</p> <p>3. Retaining the team in neighbouring lodge is unsatisfactory, as well as contrary to planning classification, therefore <i>this option is not recommended</i>.</p> <p>This report is being brought as Gateway 1-5 in order to allocate income received in Epping Forest Local Risk in 18/19 to this capital project prior to 31st March. The planned solution due to be delivered during this financial year was Option 2, which has since been rendered unviable by Local Planning Authority decision, which stated requirement for Option 1.</p> <p>Local risk funding is available for Option 1 until the end of 18/19 financial year. If not approved, further solutions to resolve compliance will require alternative funding.</p>
--	---

Resource Implications

14. Total estimated cost	Likely cost range: £106K-£156K							
	<i>Recommended option</i>							
15. Funding strategy	<p>Is the funding confirmed: All funding fully guaranteed</p>	<p>Who is providing funding: Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource</p>						
	<i>Recommended option</i>							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;">Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Epping Forest Local Risk</td> <td>£106K-£156K</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td>£106K-£156K</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Epping Forest Local Risk	£106K-£156K	Total	£106K-£156K
Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)							
Epping Forest Local Risk	£106K-£156K							
Total	£106K-£156K							
	<p><i>Epping Forest Local Risk funding available until end March 2019.</i></p>							

Appendices

<u>Appendix 1</u>	<i>Project Briefing</i>
--------------------------	--------------------------------

Appendix 2	None
-------------------	------

Contact

<u>Report Author</u>	Jo Hurst – Business Manager Epping Forest
<u>Email Address</u>	Jo.hurst@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<u>Telephone Number</u>	020 8532 5317

Options appraisal table.

Delete option numbers as appropriate

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
1. Design Summary	Construction of permanent welfare facilities	Container-style ready built welfare unit	Retain team in Flat 1 Jubilee Retreat
2. Scope and exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct small office, canteen and toilet facilities either within or alongside existing workshop. • Does not include refurbishment of Flat 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase and install container style ready made welfare unit. • Does not include refurbishment of Flat 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Do Nothing’ option not advised as contrary to planning classification and unsatisfactory welfare provision.
<i>Project Planning</i>			
3. Programme and key dates	<p>Overall project: <i>Completion by end March 2020</i></p> <p>Key dates: <i>None at present</i></p> <p>Other works dates to coordinate: <i>Refurbishment works at Flat 1 also planned (separate project) but no conflict envisaged.</i></p>	<p>Temporary project: Delivery 3-6 months but would have to be replaced by permanent solution before autumn 2021 due to Planning condition.</p> <p>Other works dates to coordinate: <i>Refurbishment works at Flat 1 also planned (separate project) but no conflict envisaged</i></p>	None
4. Delivery Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epping Forest staff • City Surveyors • Construction firm (core contract) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epping Forest staff • City Surveyors • Welfare unit manufacturer • Construction firm (core contract) 	None

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT 	
5. Risk implications	<p>Overall project risk: Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding available and Planning Authority have stated preference for permanent solution • Other than requiring planning permission, this development is not considered controversial. There are no neighbouring properties and works are unlikely to be disruptive. 	<p>Overall project risk: Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Authority (London Borough Waltham Forest) have only granted permission on temporary basis with permanent solution required by Autumn 2021. • Should a temporary unit not be replaced by permanent solution by this time this would risk enforcement action by Local Planning Authority. 	<p>Overall project risk: High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued use of Flat 1 is contrary to planning classification. • Local Housing Authority pressure to return Flat 1 to domestic occupation will increase and may lead to enforcement action. • Existing welfare facilities have been noted as unsatisfactory in H&S Audits.
6. Benefits and disbenefits	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenkeeper team can operate in a fit for purpose sanitary environment and have a warm dry refuge from bad weather. • Flat 1 can be refurbished and returned to domestic occupation, either as a staff lodge or let to a member of the public. • The City Corporation avoids enforcement action from either The HSE and Local Planning Officers. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy and relatively cheap ‘off the shelf’ solution. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only granted temporary planning permission. • Full permanent solution required by Autumn 2021, local risk funding will not be available at that time. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘No cost’ option <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Flat 1 remains in breach of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and enforcement action likely. • Potential breach of The Workplace (Health, Safety & Welfare) Regulations 1992

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff can access on-line files (including risk assessments and other key documentation) from site. • Staff are able to carry out desk-based tasks without having to travel to other EF sites. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most expensive option – but funding available from EF Local Risk until end March 2019. 		
7. Stakeholders and consultees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City Surveyors Department 2. IT teams 3. LBWF Planning Department 4. Orion Harriers Running Club (also based at Jubilee Retreat) <p><i>Equality Impact Assessment not required for this project.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City Surveyors Department 2. IT teams 3. LBWF Planning Department 4. Orion Harriers Running Club (also based at Jubilee Retreat) <p><i>Equality Impact Assessment not required for this project.</i></p>	None
Resource Implications			
8. Total Estimated cost	£106K - £156K	Approximately £40K	None

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
9. Funding strategy	<p>EF Local risk has received unanticipated income in 2018-19 due to a licence application for large long-term works compound on Forest Land, very close to the Jubilee Retreat site. This has now ceased, and the site cleared.</p> <p>If approved this funding can be transferred to Capital Project to support this build over the next financial year.</p> <p>No similar unbudgeted income is foreseen in 2019/20.</p>	<p>Below capital threshold but EF Local Risk unlikely to have sufficient resource to fund this in 19/20.</p>	<p>None – although this will prevent the ability to generate rental income from Flat 1 in the future.</p>
10. Estimated capital value/return	£106K - £156K	Approximately £40K	None
11. Ongoing revenue implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of new facility considered negligible in short/medium term and low in longer term dependant on final design (no maintenance activities of >£5K required for at least 8 years) • Reduction of maintenance requirements at Flat 1, currently in a poor state of repair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of unit • Replacement with permanent facility by Autumn 2021 likely £100-£150K 	None

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
12. Investment appraisal	Not required	Not required	Not required
13. Affordability	<p>EF Local risk has received unanticipated income in 2018-19 due to a licence application for large long-term works compound on Forest Land, very close to the Jubilee Retreat site. This has now ceased, and the site cleared.</p> <p>If approved this funding can be transferred to Capital Project to support this build over the next financial year.</p> <p>No similar unbudgeted income is foreseen in 2019/20.</p>	<p>Below capital threshold but EF Local Risk unlikely to have sufficient resource to fund this in 19/20.</p>	n/a
14. Procurement strategy/Route to Market	<p>City Procurement have confirmed that a project of this type and budget can be directly awarded to preferred contractors (Wates) but can offer support for tender process if preferred.</p>	<p>A number of ready-made welfare unit providers exist and City Procurement would assist in quote and/or tender process.</p> <p>Preferred contractors would be used for install, groundworks etc.</p>	None required.
15. Legal implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission only. • Legal implications of not providing suitable welfare facilities and not returning Flat 1 to domestic residential use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Authority have only granted permission on temporary basis with permanent solution required by Autumn 2021. Failure to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Flat 1 remains in breach of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and enforcement action likely.

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
	are outlined in section 7 of main report.	comply likely to lead to enforcement action.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential breach of The Workplace (Health, Safety & Welfare) Regulations 1992
16. Corporate property implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependant on final specification this project will result in either an additional small building, extension or internal facilities that will require future maintenance under CWP. Revenue implications will be considered and minimised in design stage. Maintenance requirements and environmental performance will be considered in the design and specification process. City Surveyors are aware of this requirement and have been involved in previous stages. Once this project complete, and Flat 1 refurbished and returned to domestic use, the maintenance and security requirements of this property will reduce. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groundworks (footings and utilities) would be required prior to installation. Container-style unit would require maintenance and programmed replacement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to realise domestic use of Flat 1. Unsuitable welfare facilities continue to degrade and require further maintenance.

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
17. Traffic implications	Small traffic increase during construction not considered significant.	Small traffic increase during delivery not considered significant.	None
18. Sustainability and energy implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot water and heating will be required. There is no mains gas to the site and neighbouring properties use oil fuelled boilers. The City Surveyors energy team will be consulted for viable sustainable alternatives to oil fuelled heating. Where possible the build will use environmentally friendly techniques, materials and design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Container style solution unlikely to achieve same environmental standards as purpose-built facility. Power and other utilities exist on site and would be utilised. Electric water heaters would be required 	None
19. IS implications	Data connection to new office only	Data connection to unit only	None
20. Equality Impact Assessment	<i>An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken</i>	<i>An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken</i>	<i>An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken</i>
21. Data Protection Impact Assessment	<i>The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact</i>	<i>The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact</i>	<i>The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact</i>

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
	<i>assessment will not be undertaken</i>	<i>assessment will not be undertaken</i>	<i>assessment will not be undertaken</i>	
22. Recommendation	Recommended	Not recommended	Not recommended	
23. Next Gateway	6	None	None	
24. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway				
	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
	Planning application	Legal requirement	Project	£1K
	Architect drawings	Final specification	Project	£5K
	Construction	Delivery	Project	£100K-£150K
Total			£106K-£156K	