# **Project Briefing**

| Project identifier        |  |                   |                 |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|
| [1a] Unique Project       | 12055  | [1b] Departmental | Hampstead Heath |
| Identifier                |  | Reference Number  | Divisional Plan |
|                           |  |                   | Project 2.4     |
| [2] Core Project Name     | Queen's Park Sandpit Refurbishment & Public Toilet Rebuild |                   |                 |
| [3] Programme Affiliation | Hampstead Heath, Parliament Hill Fields Toilets            |                   |                 |
| (if applicable)           |  |                   |                 |

| Ownership                    |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| [4] Chief Officer has signed | Colin Buttery – Director, Open Spaces Department       |
| off on this document         |  |
| [5] Senior Responsible       | Bob Warnock - Superintendent, Hampstead Heath Division |
| Officer                      |  |
| [6] Project Manager          | Richard Gentry, Constabulary and Queen's Park Manager  |

### **Description and purpose**

### [7] Project Mission statement / Elevator pitch

To provide an accessible and safe public toilet facility which is in keeping with the character of the Park with direct access from the Play Area. Constructing a sustainable building which meets with the needs of Park users and the wider community now and in the future. As well as refurbishing the sandpit adjacent to the public toilets, to provide a safe, accesible environment for challenging play, with a suitable level of risk, learning and development.

[8] Definition of Need: What is the problem we are trying to solve or opportunity we are trying to realise (i.e. the reasons why we should make a change)?

#### **Problems**

- Single point of access to the existing toilets presents safeguarding issues for parents/carers with muliple children using the playground.
- Lack of suitable toilets and changing provision for children and babies.
- The foundations of the sandpit and the play equipment within this facility is failing and beyond economical repair.

### **Opportunities**

- Opportunity to construct a sustainable facility in keeping with the environs and character of the Park
- Opportunity to construct a toilet that provides a modern, efficient and hygienic facility for all Park users.
- Opportunity to refurbish the sandpit to provide an accesible play facility with direct access to toilets.

### [9] What is the link to the City of London Corporate plan outcomes?

- [1] People are safe and feel safe.
- [2] People enjoy good health and wellbeing.
- [4] Communities are cohesive and have suitable housing and facilities.
- [9] Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.
- [10] Our physical spaces have clean air, land and water and support a thriving and sustainable natural environment.

### [10] What is the link to the departmental business plan objectives?

This project is linked to the following Open Spaces Department Business Plan Outcomes:

A.1. Our Open Spaces are accessible, inclusive and safe (1, 2, 12)

| B.5. People enjoy good health and wellbeing (2,3,4)      |     |   |     |  |     |  |  |
|--|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|--|
| [11] Note all which apply:                               |     |   |     |  |     |  |  |
| Officer: Project developed from Officer initiation       | Yes | Member: Project developed from Member initiation        | Yes | Corporate: Project developed as a large scale Corporate initiative | No  |  |  |
| Mandatory: Compliance with legislation, policy and audit | No  | Sustainability:<br>Essential for business<br>continuity | Yes | Improvement: New opportunity/ idea that leads to improvement       | Yes |  |  |

### **Project Benchmarking:**

### [12] What are the top 3 measures of success which will indicate that the project has achieved its aims?

<These should be impacts of the activity to complete the aim/objective, rather than 'finishes on time and on budget'>>

- 1) Provide facilities which are accessible and sustainable, safe and easily maintained, e.g. a hygienic facility, daily cleaning by staff more efficient. This would be measured through the Open Spaces Annual Satisfaction Survey.
- 2) Facilities whose characters are in in keeping with the open space environment. This would be measured through the Open Spaces Annual Satisfaction Survey.
- 3) Facilities which meet with the aspirations of the local community, park users and wider audience. Giving access to the toilet facility from the play area and from the Park and providing a sandpit which is challenging and offers good play value. This would be measured through the Open Spaces Annual Satisfaction Survey.

# [13] Will this project have any measurable legacy benefits/outcome that we will need to track after the end of the 'delivery' phase? If so, what are they and how will you track them? (E.g. cost savings, quality etc.)

- The toilet facility, once completed should not increase any ongoing maintenance costs under the exisiting Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) budget.
- Cost savings in resource used to clean the toilet facility.
- The sandpit is relevant and is accesible to a more diverse range of users.
- The sandpit will deliver quality and challenging play, with an appropriate level of risk, which sees an increase in visitors and user satisfaction.
- Visitors to the Park would have access to a safe, hygenic, sustainable and modern facility which can be accessed from the Park and from the segregated play area.

### [14] What is the expected delivery cost of this project (range values)[£]?

Options presented to the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee in November 2018 included delivery cost options ranging from £330,780 this would be a refurbishment of the existing toilet block and the redevelopment of the sandpit, with costs extending to £470,000, which is for a full rebuild of the toilet block and the redevelopment of the sandpit. An option of a single toilet block on the rear of the existing toilet premises was not a preferred option of the Queen's Park Consultative Group, this option, including the redevelopment of the Sandpit would be an estimated

### [15] Total anticipated on-going revenue commitment post-delivery (lifecycle costs)[£]:

There will be an annual charge for the ongoing maintenance and cleaning of Photovoltaic cells (PVC), the ongoing costs is estimated to be £670 in year 1 increasing to £700 pa in following years. The Sandpit in the Play Area would be maintained through the Parks local risk budget. These costs may be offset by a possible reduction in energy charges though use of the PVC.

### [16] What are the expected sources of funding for this project?

City Cash and External Funding.

Neither City Cash nor External Funding have been confirmed as sources of funding.

## [17] What is the expected delivery timeframe for this project (range values)? Are there any deadlines which must be met (e.g. statutory obligations)?

Lower Range estimate: January 2019 – August 2020 Upper Range estimate: January 2019 – April 2021

The project from RIBA Stage 3-4 Developed and Technical Design to RIBA Stage 7 (In use) would be 455 days.

The construction (RIBA Stage 5) is estimated to be 105 days (15 weeks). Ideally this project (construction) should take place over the winter months.

The construction phase of the Sandpit is expected to be 11 weeks.

### Project Impact:

## [18] Will this project generate public or media impact and response which the City of London will need to manage? Will this be a high-profile activity with public and media momentum?

The rebuild of the toilet facility will attract public and local media interest, the risk of this being a high-profile activity is low. The construction phase of the project may attract some negative public and media interest due to inconvenience caused to Park visitors, this would be mitigated through the use of temporary toilets. The redevelopment of the sandpit would be carried out in parallel with the rebuild of the toilet facility adjacent to the Play Area.

### [19] Who has been actively consulted to develop this project to this stage?

<(Add additional internal or external stakeholders where required) >

| \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Chamberlains:                          | Officer Name: Alison Elam                                 |  |
| Finance                                |   |  |
| Chamberlains:                          | Officer Name: To be confirmed                             |  |
| Procurement                            |   |  |
| IT                                     | Officer Name: N/A   |  |
| HR                                     | Officer Name: N/A   |  |
| Communications                         | Officer Name: Laura Simpson / John Park                   |  |
| Corporate Property                     | Officer Name: Marcus Odunlami / Sunil Singh / Warren Back |  |
| External                               | Queen's Park Consultative Group                           |  |
|  |   |  |

## [20] Is this project being delivered internally on behalf of another department? If not ignore this question. If so:

Please note the Client supplier departments.

Who will be the Officer responsible for the designing of the project?

If the supplier department will take over the day-to-day responsibility for the project, when will this occur in its design and delivery?

| Client                   | Department: Open Spaces Dept.     |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Supplier                 | Department: City Surveyor's Dept. |
| Supplier                 | Department:                       |
| Project Design Manager   | Department: City Surveyor         |
| Design/Delivery handover | Gateway stage:                    |
| to Supplier              | Post Detailed Design              |