Committees: Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee – for decision	Dates: 08 February 2023 13 February 2023
Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee -for decision	
Subject: Parliament Hill Athletics Track Resurfacing	Gateway 3/4: Options Appraisal (Regular)
Unique Project Identifier:	(9)
12335	
Report of:	For Decision
Juliemma McLoughlin, Executive Director (Environment)	
Report Author:	
Stefania Horne, Assistant Director, Natural Environment (Hampstead Heath)	

PUBLIC

	·		
1. Status update	Project Description:		
	Capital Project to resurface the Parliament Hill Athletics Track on Hampstead Heath.		
	RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)		
	Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee)		
	Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £1,717,000		
	Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): Increase of £53,000 since last report to Committee		
	Spend to Date: Nil		
	Costed Risk Provision Utilised: Nil (of which Nil amount has been drawn down since the last report to Committee) Funding Source: City Cash		
	Slippage: The anticipated timeframe to undertake the works has been brought forward to Summer 2023 in readiness for the Paris Olympics Team GB trials in 2024.		
2. Next steps and	Next Gateway: Gateway 5: Authority to Start Work		
requested decisions	Next Steps:		
uecisions	Liaison with Planning Authority (LB Camden) to develop and submit Planning Application		

- 2. Continue liaison and communication with stakeholders and the local community
- **3.** Preparation of project brief (Employer's Requirements) for the works contract
- **4.** Stage 1 appointment of a Contractor to undertake surveys, investigations and detailed design
- **5.** To establish firm costs for the works through the FM Conway term contract in place with Highways

Requested Decisions:

- 1. That additional budget of £141,025 is approved to reach the next Gateway;
- Note the total estimated cost of the project at £1,717,000 (excluding risk);
- 3. Approve the Risk Register in Appendix 2 and that a Costed Risk Provision of £283,000 is approved (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer).
- 4. That Option 1 Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface is approved
- 5. Note the new project timeline which is for earlier delivery than originally envisaged.
- 6. Delegate to the Executive Director Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee and with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee subsequent reports in order to allow for the acceleration of the programme.
- 7. Delegate to the Executive Director Environment authority to approve budget adjustments, above the existing authority within the project procedures and in consultation with the Chamberlains, between budget lines if this is within the approved total project budget

3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway

For recommended Option 1:

Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
Professional Fees	Client Side Consultant Team	City Cash	£59,250
Contractor Costs Pre-Construction Services, Surveys & Investigations, detailed design		City Cash	£78,775

Consequential Fees	LB Camden Planning Pre-App and Application Fees	City Cash	£3,000
Total			£141,025

Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £24,000 (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 2)

4. Overview of project options

Track Surfacing:

Two potential types of replacement track surface have been considered for the refurbishment project,

- 1. Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface
- 2. Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface;

Floodlighting Upgrade

Four Options have been considered by the Stakeholders and Project Board. These were:

- Replace existing luminaires with new Light Emitting Diodes (LED), retaining existing masts, controls and cabling
- 2. Replace luminaires and masts with new in same locations, retaining existing controls and cabling
- 3. Replace luminaires and masts in new locations, retaining cabling and controls
- 4. Full replacement system including fewer new masts in new locations, cabling and controls

Only one option has received full support which is to provide a full replacement system including fewer new masts in new locations, cabling and controls. Retaining the existing columns and/or lighting would not provide the opportunity to install a better scheme with lower energy requirements in line with the climate action strategy.

The full replacement system upgrade will provide energy efficient, improved lighting to the track as well as lighting the infield and eastern side of the track, future proofing the facility in relation to lighting.

	The full replacement system will provide improved light spread, reduced light spillage but it is anticipated will need planning permission to implement.	
	To support the planning application, the recommended option includes for new controls to switch the lighting between an average lux level of 200lux (as required for Class 2 level events), and a lower average lux level of 100lux for the everyday training / usage of the facility.	
	The full replacement floodlighting system is supported by the Stakeholders and approved by the Project Board.	
5. Recommende	Track Surfacing:	
d option	The Recommended Option is (1) Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface.	
	The Specialist Consultant has advised that:	
	 The sandwich system is the more cost effective solution The sandwich system is designed as a hybrid between Porous and Solid Polyurethane U system and The sandwich system is expected to last longer (in relation to shock absorbency) before reaching minimum UK Athletics Performance Standards 	
	This Option is supported by the Stakeholders and approved by the Project Board.	
	For the lighting of the track, a full replacement of the floodlighting system is recommended.	
6. Risk	Costed Risk Provision Utilised at Last Gateway: Nil Change in Costed Risk: -£53,000	
	The Gateway 5 report is sought to be approved under delegation and CRP will be required at that stage. The CRP for Gateway 5 currently estimated is £283,000.	
	Further information available in the Risk Register (Appendix 2) and Options Appraisal.	
7. Procurement approach	The Procurement Strategy is to execute the works through the FM Conway term contract with City Operations Division which has recently been tendered and is considered competitive.	

The project will be procured through a design and build approach with clear roles and responsibilities including for design and execution.
FM Conway will procure the surfacing and floodlighting works from a list of accredited specialists, subject to confirmation of capability and capacity to undertake the works.
The Procurement Strategy has been agreed by the Procurement team utilising the current term contract with FM Conway.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet	
Appendix 2	Risk Register (for recommended option)	
Appendix 3	Programme	
Appendix 4	Cost Book – NON-PUBLIC	
	This Appendix is exempt from public consideration as it relates to functions of the Court of Common Council that	
	are not subject to the provisions of Part VA and Schedule	
	12A of the Local Government Act 1972.	

Contact

Report Author Stefania Horne	
Email Address	stefania.horne@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	+447517829463

Options Appraisal Matrix

Track Surfacing

Op	otion Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface	Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface
1.	Brief description of option	A hybrid system of both the porous and the solid system. This surface layer was designed to provide a surface for high level competition at a more competitive price than the Solid PU system. The system is constructed in multiple layers: • Base layer made up of black rubber granules bound with polyurethane resin (as per porous design) • Final flood layer of polyurethane topped with an EPDM (rubber) surface dressing	Designed for high level competition, high intensity usage, and have harder surface consistency. This system is a non-porous full depth construction made up of typically two layers: • Base polyurethane flood coat layer impregnated with rubber granules • Final flood layer of polyurethane topped with an EPDM (rubber) surface dressing
2.	Scope and exclusions	 Core Works to be taken forward Sandwich Option Track Surfacing Works Floodlight Improvement to Circuit, Infield and Eastern Side of the Track High Jump Fan Improvements Stakeholder Requested Works (to be undertaken subject to available funds) Improvements to Existing Long Jump Facility 	 Core Works to be taken forward Solid Polyurethane Option Track Surfacing Works Floodlight Improvement to Circuit, Infield and Eastern Side of the Track High Jump Fan Improvements Stakeholder Requested Works (to be undertaken subject to available funds) Improvements to Existing Long Jump Facility

Option Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface	Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface
	 Additional Power Units Rain Cover's for users and judges Timing Kit In-Situ Stand for Equipment Storage Hooks for Stretching Exercises Phone Lockers (with charging stations) Potential in-field drainage (if viable from cost to be received) Benches (to be confirmed type) New PA System The following works have been agreed not to be taken forward: Additional 2 Lanes Along Main Sprint Straight The inclusion of 2 extra lanes (making the track a 10-lane main straight) would not be possible without adjusting the existing bund around the track and/or adding gabion walling to the area. It is not proposed to extend the track to 10 lanes on the main straight as the additional cost / programme / risk implications appear to outweigh the benefit of its inclusion within the scheme. Artificial Grass Surface to Infield There is insufficient budget to undertake this work. Estimates for pitches range from approx. £800,000 - £1,200,000 in total cost which cannot be funded from the existing authority. 	 Additional Power Units Rain Cover's for users and judges Timing Kit In-Situ Stand for Equipment Storage Hooks for Stretching Exercises Phone Lockers (with charging stations) Potential in-field drainage (if viable from cost to be received) Benches (to be confirmed type) New PA System The following works have been agreed not to be taken forward: Additional 2 Lanes Along Main Sprint Straight The inclusion of 2 extra lanes (making the track a 10-lane main straight) would not be possible without adjusting the existing bund around the track and/or adding gabion walling to the area. It is not proposed to extend the track to 10 lanes on the main straight as the additional cost / programme / risk implications appear to outweigh the benefit of its inclusion within the scheme. Artificial Grass Surface to Infield There is insufficient budget to undertake this work. Estimates for pitches range from approx. £800,000 - £1,200,000 in total cost which cannot be funded from the existing authority.

Op	otion Summary			Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface	
		Additional Long Jump Facility It was determined by the stakeholder team that there isn't a viable solution to locate a new long jump facility, and that improving the existing long jump facility to provide facility for visually impaired athletes would be of better benefit.		Additional Long Jump Facility It was determined by the stakeholder team that there isn't a viable solution to locate a new long jump facility, and that improving the existing long jump facility to provide facility for visually impaired athletes would be of better benefit	
Pr	oject Planning				
3.	Programme and key dates	The Project is planned to complete at the end September 2023 as the specialist track laying work is weather dependent. Key dates: Gateway 3/4 – February 2023 Gateway 5 – Appointment of FM Conway as Contractor - April 2023 Construction Works to commence on site - June 2023 Gateway 6 – Completion of Works on Site – September 2023			
4.	Risk implications	Overall project option risk: Medium Main Risks are financial and programme. The construction Market is in a state of flux with high demand leading to increased costs and inflationary pressures. The scope of works is to be defined with fixed price to be agreed for the works to be executed within approved funds. The risk is that the Works exceed the Approved Cost Estimate but mitigated by Costed Risk Provision. The Track Surfacing Works are weather dependent and must be undertaken during the summer months. This coincides with reduced track activity by Users Groups, particularly schools. The main programme risk is that Specialist Works			

Ор	tion Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface	Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface		
		Contractors do not have capacity to undertake the work over the Summer months or at a premium. This is mitigated with earlier and direct market engagement. Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).			
5.	Stakeholders and consultees	Hampstead Heath Track Forum (Highgate Harriers Athletics Club / Mornington Chasers Running Club / Serpentine Running Club / Hampstead Rugby Club).			
		Hampstead Heath Sports & Wellbeing Forum.			
		3. Hampstead Health Consultative Committee.			
		4. Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood & Queen's Park Committee.			
		5. City Surveyors Department.			
		6. Chamberlains Department.			
		7. Planning Authority – London Borough of Camden			
		8. Schools			
		9. Local Residents			
6.	Benefits of option	Fulfils project objectives to retain TrackMark accreditation, enabling the facility to continue to host national and international standard athletics related events and competitions	Fulfils project objectives to retain TrackMark accreditation, enabling the facility to continue to host national and international standard athletics related events and competitions		
		Breakdown maintenance and repair costs for the wider facility will be reduced as the project also includes related works such as replacing the	Breakdown maintenance and repair costs for the wider facility will be reduced as the project also includes related works such as replacing the		

Option Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface		Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface		
	 floodlighting with LED and works to the jumping and throwing infrastructure. 3. The sandwich system is the more cost effective solution 4. The sandwich system is expected to last longer (in relation to shock absorbency) before reaching minimum UK Athletics Performance Standards 			floodlighting with LED throwing infrastructure	and works to the jumping and
7. Disbenefits of option	The potential disbenefit is a short term one in that the during the delivery period, the facilities will not be available for use. However, the impact is lessened due the delivery being completed in the off-peak season and a 'phasing plan' being considered to allow some track usage to continue during the early implementation period where possible.		1. The potential disbenefit is a short term one in that the during the delivery period, the facilities will not be available for use. However, the impact is lessened due the delivery being completed in the off-peak season and a 'phasing plan' being considered to allow some track usage to continue during the early implementation period where possible.		
			2.	Higher Capital Cost (£160	,000 more than Option 1)
Resource Implications					
8. Total estimated cost	Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £1,717,000 Total estimated cost: (including risk): £2,000,000			tal estimated cost (excludin tal estimated cost: (includin	

Option Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface	Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface		
9. Funding strategy	The project has been reviewed and agreed as part of the Corporation's review of its capital programme. A number of items have been excluded from the project scope in order to keep costs within the agreed project budget. These were as follows:			
	 Additional 2 Lanes Along Main Sprint Straight Artificial Grass Surface to Infield Additional Long Jump Facility 			
	These items were deemed desirable but not essential for project delivery but may, in the future, be delivered separately, subject to external funding.			
10. Investment appraisal	N/A			
11. Estimated capital value/return	Capital Cost of this Option estimated at: £2,000,000	Capital Cost of this Option estimated at: £2,160,000 (£160,000 more than Option 1)		
12. Ongoing revenue implications	<u>Decreasing maintenance costs</u> : Breakdown maintenance and repair costs for the wider facility will be reduced as the project also includes related works such as replacing the floodlighting with LED, and works to the jumping and throwing infrastructure.			
	<u>Increased income</u> : There will be opportunities to increase income generation by harnessing the value of the international venue as well as increasing participation locally.			
13. Affordability	For this Option, it is possible that some of the additional scope of works identified by the Stakeholders and Project Board can be afforded (subject to defining costs).	For this Option, it is likely that the additional scope of works identified by the Stakeholders and Project Board cannot be afforded.		

Option Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface	Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface	
	The cost of the additional scope of works will be ascertained ahead of the Gateway 5 submission and included within final proposals should there be sufficient funding available.		
14. Legal implications	Compliance only - Planning Legislation - Building Regulations - CDM Regulations	Compliance only - Planning Legislation - Building Regulations - CDM Regulations	
15. Corporate property implications	This project aligns with the Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy 2020-25 to ensure that operational assets are maintained in good, safe and statutory compliant condition.		
16. Traffic implications	The execution of the Project will increase traffic flows on local roads during the construction works, to be controlled through a Traffic Management Plan to be prepared by the Contractor.		
17. Sustainability and energy implications	Both Track Surfacing Options offer a similar lifespan of 15-20 years before the first overlay, with the possibility that the Sandwich Option may offer 1-2 years of additional usage. Both options will eventually become worn and require an overlay of the surface layer using the same materials between Options. All floodlighting works options include replacement LED luminaires that have a lower energy requirement than the existing. The full replacement system includes for replacement switching and controls to illuminate the track at a lower light intensity (100 lux) during normal usage with high light intensity (200 lux) at Level 2 Events. The average light intensity provided by the current system has been recorded at 362 lux which is higher than that required for Level 1 and 2 Events and normal usage.		

Option Summary	Option 1 - Non-Porous Sandwich System Surface	Option 2 - Non-Porous Solid Polyurethane System Surface		
	The new floodlighting system will provide better uniformity of light across the track, at a lower light intensity than existing and use more energy efficient luminaires in its design. This is considered to meet regulations. An Energy and Performance Rating is not being provided for the Project as the work to be undertaken does not relate to			
	buildings.			
18. IS implications	N/A	N/A		
19. Equality Impact Assessment	An Equality Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as current standards of provision will continue. However, the existing long jump provision on site will be widened to enable visually impaired athletes to also use the facility.	An Equality Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as current standards of provision will continue. However, the existing long jump provision on site will be widened to enable visually impaired athletes to also use the facility.		
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	N/A	N/A		
21. Recommendation	Recommended	Not recommended		