

CASTLEREAGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the proceedings of the Leisure Park Board held, in committee, in the Board Room at Dundonald International Ice Bowl on Monday 19 September 2011 at 6.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

ALDERMEN

J Beattie MBE
M Henderson MBE (In the Chair)
G Robinson

COUNCILLORS:

C Hall
T Jeffers
T Morrow
J White

IN ATTENDANCE:

Director of Leisure Services, General Manager Leisure & Marketing, DIIB Project Manager (from 6.12 pm) and Assistant Members' Services Officer.

APOLOGIES:

Councillors Drysdale, Hanvey and Spratt

LPB/2011/125 : DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (6.00 pm)

Members and officers were invited to declare any pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests (including gifts and hospitality) they should have in respect of items on this agenda. There were no declarations of interest.

Noted.

LPB/2011/126 : MINUTES OF LEISURE PARK BOARD MEETING DATED 15 AUGUST 2011 (6.00 pm)

It was proposed by Councillor White, seconded by Councillor Jeffers and

RESOLVED: - That the minutes of the Leisure Park Board meeting held on 15 August 2011 be accepted as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

MATTERS ARISING

LPB/2011/127 : UNDERPASS PROJECT (Minute LPB/2011/112 refers) (6.01pm)

The General Manager Leisure & Marketing updated Members on progress with the underpass project. He advised that funding for the project was still being sought and that Members would be kept apprised.

Noted.

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF LEISURE SERVICES

LPB/2011/128 : TRADING ACCOUNTS (6.01 pm)

The Director of Leisure referred Members to the trading accounts for the period up to August 2011. She pointed out that figures showed an overall favourable variance for the year to date of £17,345. She advised that was the result of an adverse variance in income of £45,652 and a favourable variance in expenditure of £62,997.

Alderman Beattie referred to recent statistics indicating a substantial downturn in expenditure on leisure activities within the GB mainland. Councillor Morrow enquired whether the reduction in expenditure was mainly due to savings on staffing costs. The Director advised that there were savings in expenditure on goods and materials as well as staffing costs.

Noted.

LPB/2011/129 : STAFF TRAINING REQUEST (6.03pm)

The Director of Leisure Services reminded Members that annual appraisals were carried out with all staff to monitor performance, identify areas for improvement and agree any training needs that would assist with personal development and performance in post. She reported that the General Manager Leisure and Marketing had requested agreement to refresh some of the qualifications he had previously obtained but which now required revalidation.

The Director reported that Prince 2 was a project management qualification and the course ran locally over 5 days and cost £985 + VAT. She stated that the course would benefit the officer in his role managing a variety of leisure projects in conjunction with the Capital Projects Officer. She advised that the officer had not availed of any other personal development training to date.

The Director advised that no specific budget provision had been made for this training in this financial year but that it might be possible to identify other training underspend where provision had been made but not drawn upon due to a change in circumstances for the officers concerned.

In response to Members' queries, the Director advised that the reasons for a training underspend could include officers being unable to undertake courses due to personal circumstances or work related issues. She advised that officers were allowed a number of years by universities to complete professional courses. She confirmed that the Council could claw back expenditure in specific circumstances.

After discussion it was proposed by Councillor White, seconded by Councillor Hall and

RESOLVED:

- (a) that approval be given to the General Manager Leisure & Marketing's attendance at a Prince 2 course at a cost of approximately £985 plus VAT
- (b) that, should it not be possible to facilitate this training in the current financial year from an underspend within the wider training budget, provision be made in the estimates for 2012/13 for the delivery of this training

LPB/2011/130 : DIIB 25TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION “ROLL BACK” DAY
(6.05 pm)

The Director of Leisure Services reported that the DIIB had opened its doors to the general public on 23 September 1986 and the only activity available at that time was ice skating. She advised that it was proposed that DIIB host a 25th birthday “roll back” celebration on Friday 23 September 2011, with the focus of the celebrations being on the ice rink. It was recommended that the admission prices for ice skating on the day “roll back” to those charged at the time of opening.

The Director advised that initial discussions had taken place with the Chair of the Board who had agreed that management should progress the initiative so that the necessary arrangements could be put in place in time for the event. It the Board was willing to retrospectively approve the proposal, admission prices for all public ice skating session on Friday 23 September 2011 would be £1.50 with an additional charge of 50p for skate hire.

Members were advised that the marketing department would target school groups for daytime business and the evening ice skating session would be a themed 80s disco. There would also be an 80s theme to the Xtreme bowling session on the Friday evening. It was noted that, as there would be no price promotion in the bowling centre, this would not be advertised in advance but would add value to the customer experience at the time.

The Director advised that, while there might be some reduction in income due to the reduced admission charges, it was anticipated that the loss could be offset by increased footfall and positive PR coverage gained from the event. She indicated that the Community Telegraph had indicated that it was going to feature the event on its front page and the Mayor had been interviewed in this regard.

The General Manager Leisure & Marketing advised that the 25th anniversary events would continue throughout the year particularly at Christmas and Easter.

RESOLVED: that the Board give retrospective approval to the proposal to hold a 25th Birthday Celebration “Roll Back” Day at DIIB on Friday 23 September 2011 and noted that such celebration opportunities might continue throughout the year.

LPB/2011/131 : CHP PLANT EFFICIENCY REPORT (6.07 pm)

The Director of Leisure Services advised that the Technical Manager’s report on the efficiency of the DIIB CHP plant over the last period would be tabled at the next meeting of the Board.

Noted.

LPB/2011/132 : WORLD POLICE AND FIRE GAMES (WPFG) 2013 UPDATE (6.07 pm)

It was reported that Sport NI had now confirmed in writing that Dundonald International Ice Bowl had progressed to the next stage in the selection process as a venue for both the ice hockey and ten pin bowling events. The Director of Leisure advised that she would provide the Board with further updates as and when available.

Noted.

LPB/2011/133 : DEFERMENT OF ITEM (6.08 pm)

RESOLVED: that consideration of the item on the tender appointment of the Integrated Design Team and the Independent Cost Manager for the redevelopment of DIIB be deferred until later in the meeting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

LPB/2011/134 : ACCESS TO SKATING RINK

The Director of Leisure Services reported on an issue arising when the family of a child with a visual disability had complained that access to the skating rink had been restricted. She explained that officers had felt that, particularly at peak times of usage of the rink, there were health and safety issues to be considered. She stated that the family had been given the opportunity to accept an alternative time when a skating aide would be available to accompany the child onto the ice.

The Director advised that she had been interviewed on this matter on a local radio programme that had approached the matter from the basis of possible disability discrimination without taking into account the health and safety issues. She stated that she was not aware of any further adverse publicity on the matter following her interview.

Noted.

LPB/2011/135 : PROPOSED PEAK PRICING PERIODS AND HOLIDAY CLOSURES FOR DIIB 2011/2012

PEAK PRICING PERIODS:

Halloween Half Term	Thurs 27 October 2011 – Sun 6 November 2011
Christmas	Mon 19 December 2011 – Tues 3 January 2012
February Half Term	Mon 13 February 2012 – Fri 17 February 2012
Bank Holiday	Mon 19 March 2012 (St Patrick's Day)
Easter	Mon 2 April 2012 – Sun 15 April 2012
Bank Holiday	Mon 7 May 2012
Bank Holiday	Mon 4 June 2012 (May bank holiday moved to June)
Bank Holiday	Tues 5 June 2012 (Queen's Diamond Jubilee)
Summer 2012	Wed 27 June 2012 – Sun 2 September 2012

HOLIDAY CLOSURES:

	Closing:	Re-Opening:
Christmas	6.00 pm Sat 24 December 2011	10.00 am Tues 27 December 2011
New Year	6.00 pm Tues 31 December 2011	10.00 am Sun 1 January 2012
July	6.00 pm Wed 11 July 2012	10.00 am Fri 13 July 2012

The General Manager Leisure & Marketing stated that, as individual Education Boards' half term dates might vary, officers were requesting permission to alter these dates if considered necessary. The Chair asked that details of peak pricing periods and holiday closures be included in the Council's website.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Board approve the peak pricing periods and holiday closures as detailed above with the proviso that officers be given authority to vary the half term peak pricing periods as considered necessary to take account of individual Education Boards' half term dates
- (b) that details of peak pricing periods and holiday closures be included on the Council's website

LPB/2011/136 : UPDATE IN THE PROGRESSION OF STAGE 2 FOR THE TENDER TO APPOINT THE DESIGN TEAM AND COST MANAGER FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF DIIB (6.12 pm)

Members considered a detailed paper (copy previously circulated) giving an overview of the various options available for the procurement of the Design Team and the Cost Manager for the redevelopment of DIIB. The Director of Leisure Services advised that New Engineering Contracts (NEC) had provided a number of main options and a representative from Cleaver Fulton and Rankin (CFR) would in attendance at the meeting to take Members through the options and their respective advantages and disadvantages.

Members noted that the paper also included the proposed scoring matrix for each appointment along with the evaluation panel.

The Director advised that, in order to progress stage 2, it would be necessary to develop a detailed scope of works document and an invitation to tender document along with a memorandum of information. She stated that, in order to ensure that all the necessary information was contained within the scope of works document, it was essential that the predicted needs of the relevant stakeholders were sought and clarified at this stage. She advised that CFR would continue to work with the Council's Project Officer on these documents with a view to presenting them to the Board for consideration and approval in October.

The Director advised that no further progress had been made in respect of the DETI application. She stated that, as Members might be aware, the Chief Executive had recently written to DETI outlining the Council's concerns at the proposals for the programme.

The Chairman then welcomed Mr Steve Brown of Cleaver Fulton & Rankin (CFR) to the meeting.

Mr Brown stated that CFR were very pleased to have been appointed as legal and procurement advisors for the Board. He stated that the paper before the Board summarised the procurement strategy for the appointment of the Integrated Design Team (IDT) and the Independent Cost Consultant (ICC). He advised that the decision to use the Professional Services Contract (PSC) from the suite of the New Engineering Contracts (NEC3) had already been agreed and the choice before the Board now was between the main options of the PSC for appointment of the IDT and ICC. He summarised these options as follows:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| Option A | Lump sum fixed price – payment linked to completed deliverables |
| Option C | Target contract with pain/gain share – payment of actual cost but capped |
| Option E | Total cost reimbursable contract (not considered) |
| Option G | A mix of Options A & C |

With regard to the appointment of the IDT, Mr Brown stated that Option A had scored the highest against some principal objectives that determined best value for money. He advised that the role of the design team was very complex and was tied to deliverables. Under Option A the IDT would only be paid for completed activities and this gave the Board certainty on pricing. An important factor of Option A was that it involved considerably less administrative costs than other contracts. He recommended that Option A was the preferred option for employment of the IDT.

With regard to the appointment of ICC, Mr Brown stated that the ICC would be required to interact with the IDT but would remain independent of it and would control the cost and keep it within budget. He recommended Option C for

appointment of ICC. He stated that the target cost could be capped to minimise risk and suggested a cap of 5%. As the ICC would be a much smaller team than the IDT, the administrative burden would be smaller for both sides. He stated that Option C would allow the ICC to work on an ad hoc basis with a lot more flexibility while still maintaining certainty on costs.

With regard to the tender evaluation criteria, Mr Brown recommended the following criteria:

Consultancy	Technical	Cost
Integrated Design Team (IDT)	60%	40%
Independent Cost Consultant (ICC)	30%	70%

With regard to the IDT criteria, Mr Brown made the point that, with no in-house architect, the Board would be outsourcing the whole of the design and planning process to the IDT. For that reason it was important that the Board secure the services of the best IDT possible with the highest levels of ability and performance. Accordingly the IDT criteria were weighted towards technical ability.

Mr Brown stated that this evaluation criteria coupled with the choice of Option A as the PSC would give the Board cost certainty as well as a high level of technical expertise. He stated that, in the present economic climate, tender prices were coming in quite low. He concluded that Option A together with these tender evaluation criteria would give the Board the most economically advantageous tender.

With regard to ICC, he stated that the important factor would be that the ICC came to the project with expert knowledge backed by an extensive amount of relevant cost data. He advised that a key issue to ensure the most cost effective design would be the ICC's ability to interact with the IDT and there would have to be a certain amount of ad hoc involvement, the timing of which would be difficult to determine. For all these reasons it was considered that Option C was the most appropriate contract for the ICC.

Mr Brown recommended the following panels of personnel for evaluation of submitted ITT tenders:

IDT	Director of Leisure Services DIIB Project Manager Technical Manager Mr Brown (CFR)
ICC	Director of Leisure Services DIIB Project Manager Mr Brown (CFR)

The meeting was then opened to questions. The Director of Leisure Services referred to Mr Brown's statement that the Board was outsourcing the whole of the design process and enquired when the decision could be taken as to how

much of the design would be client led and at what stage options such as design and build would need to be formalised. Mr Brown stated that, when the IDT had been appointed, there would be various stages of design to be completed before the main contractor was appointed and during that process consideration would be given as to whether the design would be client led or build and design. However, the NEC form of contract enabled a combination of fully designed elements and contractor designed elements to be undertaken as the works progressed.

The Director stated that, as the redevelopment proposals involved a number of private operators, their requirements would need to be included in the scope of works document. Mr Brown confirmed that as much detail as possible was required now in order to ensure price certainty. He stated that, if the Board had a good understanding of the elements of the building, then the key decisions were already made and the detail of the design of these elements could come later. He considered that the scope for the IDT should be kept vague at this stage.

In response to a query by Councillor White as to whether the IDT could make design adjustments as the development progressed, Mr Brown stated that the NEC contract included a built-in change process. Councillor White referred to the importance of integrating technological advances into the development. He enquired whether the 60:40 split between technical and cost was standard in developments of this type and scale.

Mr Brown responded that there was no standard percentage split. He advised that, if the development were an office block, it would be possible to play around with the percentages but, as this was a unique development, it was important to weight the percentages towards technical expertise rather than cost. The Director of Leisure Services stated that one of the biggest challenges in the development would be the integration of the new development with the live environment within the existing building. Mr Brown agreed that the phasing issues involved in the development were also a factor in selecting a balance weighted in favour of technical ability.

The Chairman thanked Mr Brown for his presentation and Mr Brown left the meeting at 6.39 pm

The Director of Leisure Services asked the Board for authority to consult with relevant stake holders in drawing up documents such as the scope of works. She stated that at this stage the Board still had to decide what it wanted included in the redevelopment proposals and the cost of various elements would be a deciding factor in whether they could be included or not.

After discussion it was proposed by Alderman Robinson, seconded by Councillor Morrow and

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Board approve the PSC main option for appointment of the Integrated Design Team as Option A and for appointment of the Independent Cost Consultant as Option C
- (b) that the Board approve the tender evaluation criteria for the Integrated Design Team as 60% Technical and 40% Cost and the tender evaluation criteria for the Independent Cost Consultant as 30% Technical and 70% Cost
- (c) that the Board approve the panels of personnel for evaluation of ITT tenders as detailed above
- (d) that the Board authorise officers to consult with relevant stakeholders in drawing up the scope of works and other documents required to progress the development

Some discussion ensued regarding various aspects of the redevelopment process including the role of the Council's Planning Officer. The DIIB Project Manager advised that the IDT would include professionals such as Architects, Civil & Structural Engineers, Mechanical & Electrical Engineers, Ice Rink & Pool Specialists and Planning Consultants. He advised that it would be the IDT's Planning Consultants who would liaise with planners to drive the design forward. The Council's Planning Officer would sit on the Board's in-house team during the development process to advise and contribute towards progressing the development from a planning perspective.

As there was no further business the meeting ended at 6.53 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

MAYOR